THE CHURCHMAN.

THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii. 15.

VOL. VI. No. 43. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1837. WHOLE NUMBER, 303.

THE CHURCHMAN.

From Archdeacon Strachan's Sermon.

ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

In turning from the Church universal to the portion to which we have the happiness to belong, and which stands, by common consent, at the head of all Protestant denominations, we may with truth aver, that cleansed by divine Providence from the corruptions of former ages, she has restored, in a great measure, the modes of worship which prevailed in the purest times of Christianity, and revived, in the simplicity of her ministrations, much of the lively image of the primitive Church. Her fundamental articles are strictly agreeable to Scripture—her devotional exercises are not only intelligible to the meanest capacity, but may be safely pronounced superior to all other sacred compositions of human origin, for simplicity of language, fervor of piety, and evangelical sentiments. Her orders of priesthood derive their origin from the apostles, they are confirmed by the earliest usage, and are recommended by the great utility of clerical subordination. Thus deservedly celebrated for her institutions and her modes of worship, our Church seeks to extend to her children in this colony all the advantages which she has for centuries been conferring in our father land. She feels the imperative duty, that as God has revealed and committed the truth to her care, she is responsible for its dispensation, not only as regards her members at home, but her members at a distance. The Gospel is not confided to man to be hid under a bushel, but after directing his own conduct as it prescribes, it becomes his duty to teach it to his brethren. Hence, every Christian is, to a certain extent, a missionary, and every Christian nation is bound to use all its energies in promoting the knowledge and power of the gospel truth among nations still in darkness, and more especially it is bound to extend to its children, and those of the same household of faith, the same privileges, as regards religious instruction and culture, when they remove to colonies, that their fellow-subjects enjoy at home. Hence, our mother country, in giving a constitution to this colony, acted wisely, and in strict accordance with Christian duty, in making provision for the religious education of the people in that form of Christianity which she herself had adopted, and which merits, as it has obtained for many ages, the approbation of thousands of the most enlightened friends of Christ, as the purest which has ever yet existed.

The progress of religion and the building of churches in new colonies resemble, in no small degree, the first ages of the Gospel. For many years after the commencement of our settlements, there were only three clergymen, with their congregations, within the vast bounds of Upper Canada. They have, indeed, multiplied in number, but far too slowly for the wants of our people; for, even at this late period, we scarcely count fifty clergymen actively employed, and allowing to each four places for regular and occasional service, or in all two hundred stations where the ministrations of the Church are dispensed; it is almost nothing in a country so vast and splendid as Upper Canada, or, perhaps, rather like a few cultivated spots in a great wilderness.

Even for this much we stand indebted, not to the provision for the maintenance of Protestant clergy, secured by the constitutional act, which has been most unwisely allowed to become a subject of contention, but to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and which, till very lately, has been the sole instrument, under God, of preserving the doctrine, rites, and ordinances of the Church of England in the colony. It sent us ministers, catechists, and schoolmasters; it promoted the building of places of worship; distributed the holy Scriptures, the liturgy, and religious books suited to the wants and different characters of the population. But this venerable society has been lately compelled to withhold further assistance from the colony, on account of the withdrawal of the aid which Parliament has been hitherto in the habit of extending through that institution, for the support of the Established Church in the British North American provinces. Henceforth the Church in this colony must depend upon local resources, and these must be derived either from the government or the voluntary contributions of the people. We have seen, from the history of the Church of God, that these two have been generally combined. In the Jewish Church, the people were called upon to assist their rulers, by free-will offerings, in building the tabernacle and temples; and their voluntary contributions were always considerable, though the principal expense of supporting the public ministrations of religion was defrayed by government. And thus has it ever been with Christian nations;—the Established Church has from the first been maintained out of permanent endowments granted by the state, or private individuals, and the voluntary offerings of living worshippers. But in planting colonies the case has been somewhat different; for, with the exception of England, other nations provided for their religious instruction, by giving them the same ecclesiastical establishment with the parent states, and still more abundant means of support. In legislating for the Canadas, Great Britain, ashamed of her former inattention to the Christian well being of her colonists, and observing the care which France had taken of the religious instruction of her former subjects in Lower Canada, laid the foundation of a future provision for the support of Christianity, according to the forms and discipline of her own Establishment,—a provision which has been hitherto of little advantage, and which never can supersede the generous exertions of individuals. But I stop not at present to inquire how far it is the duty of government to provide for the maintenance of religion among the people, as my object on this occasion is to call your attention to the deplorable state of the Church in respect to government, discipline, and moral influence—now that she is in a manner cast off, and left to herself—and to urge you to devise such measures as may give her something of that efficiency which the Church possessed when recently planted in Asia, and in the land of our fathers.

So long as the population of the colony was small, and our congregations few and far distant from one another, little more could be required of the clergy than personal piety, and a faithful and vigilant discharge of their pastoral duties, in their parishes and neighborhoods. Nor while fostered by the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and cherished by the tender care of the civil government, was much required of our people. The ministrations of the Church were provided without money and without price, and, with the exception of building a church, the laity were seldom called upon for any assistance. Matters are now much changed. Separated, in a great measure, from the mother Church, and deprived, by the pressure of the times, of much of that protection which the civil government has hitherto willingly accorded—assailed on every side by enemies, whose hostility is openly avowed, it becomes both the clergy and laity to prepare themselves for such a state of things, and this the more speedily since, even within the pale of the Church herself, we have many lukewarm friends, who, from indifference or indolence, are content to sit still and allow us to be robbed of our vested rights under the hollow pretence of a spurious and unprincipled liberality. But this must be no longer permitted. The time for apathy and inactivity has passed away, and every friend of the Church must exert himself to the utmost in her favor; nor can any one be excused who does not employ the talents intrusted to him by his divine Master in promoting his glory through that institution of which he is the Head.

Happily, our Church contains within herself all the principles and sources necessary to meet the present crisis, and, by calling them into action, to embrace within her bosom all her children in the colony, were they ten times more numerous than they really are, or can ever become. From her earliest beginning in England, she has had an episcopal constitution, and flourished more than one hundred and fifty years before becoming a legal establishment—an event which did not take place till Constantine the Great declared Christianity to be the religion of the empire. This Emperor's mother was a native of Great Britain, and in that island, which was in all probability the place of his birth, he was proclaimed master of the world. Nor is it a violent conjecture to suppose that, under such circumstances, his native province possessed no common share of his favor and protection.

At the Council of Arles, which was convened by Constantine, three British bishops attended—a proof that the British Church had already acquired some degree of eminence. It was established long before the bishop of Rome had any authority beyond his own diocese; and in the seventh century it was secured in its rights and privileges by the great charter of English liberty. When, therefore, it is asked where the Church of England was before the Reformation, we answer, in the records of remote antiquity, and in the strongholds of Magna Charta: and it stood unaltered in its constitution by the Reformation, which merely enabled it to wash itself clean from the impurities which it had contracted during its long connexion with Rome, and to reject the supremacy of her bishop. In every thing else it remained the same religious society—the same legitimate branch of the visible Church that it had been for more than twelve centuries, though now renovated and brought back nearer to the standard of the primitive Church.

The Church of England, according to its original constitution, is governed by national, provincial, and diocesan synods.

The national synod or convocation is early mentioned, and was at first of a mixed character; because, from the superior ability and learning of the clergy, they were for many ages summoned to all deliberate assemblies, civil as well as religious. On this account, it is frequently difficult to determine of many of these assemblies, whether they were convened for ecclesiastical or civil purposes. In after times the convocations became complete and systematic in their organization, and consisted of two houses, with duties and privileges belonging to each. To the Upper House belonged the power of originating all measures; the power of jurisdiction; of presenting subjects of debate; the choice and number of the committees of the Lower House; determining the right of election; censuring for absence, and proroguing the convocation.

To the Lower House belonged the right of presenting their own and the Church's grievances to the Upper House; offering petitions for making canons and revising old ones; of being assessors of the Upper House in judicial affairs; and of dissenting from any matter, so as to hinder it from passing into a synodical act.

2. *Provincial Synods.*—In these, by the constitution of the Church, presbyters had the right of sitting, and a negative on the bishops in all conclusive acts—but such synods at length merged into the convocation.

3. *Diocesan Synods.*—"It has been the constant sense of the ancient councils and fathers of the Church, that every bishop has a commission from our Saviour to govern his diocese, and in order thereunto to convene his priests under him. The common direction of the canon law appoints the meeting once a year, and this *Linwood* seems to deliver as the rule of the English Church: and thus the matter is stated in the designed reformation of the canons drawn up in the reign of Henry VIII.

"To this annual synod, all the clergy who had any benefice within the diocese were obliged to come, under the penalty of a suspension. If the diocese was small, and had but one archdeaconry in it, the whole clergy met together at once: if it were more large, the bishop sometimes divided his synods according to the number of his archdeaconries, and held his diocesan council at several times, and in several places, but still the method of business was the same in all."

The form of holding these synods is as follows: "The clergy in solemn procession came to the church assigned, at the time appointed by the bishop, and seated themselves by the priority of their ordination. Then the deacons and laity were admitted. The bishop, or in his absence the vicar, when the office for the occasion was over, made a solemn exhortation to the audience—then a sermon was preached—after which, if the clergy had any complaints to make, or any thing else to offer, they were heard by the synod. The complaints of the clergy being over, the laity made theirs; then the bishop proposed his diocesan constitutions to them, after which, if nothing remained to be done, he made a synodical exhortation, by way of injunction, to his clergy; and so all concluded with solemn prayers suitable to the business."—*Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, vol. i., p. 249.

Of these different synods the diocesan is the only one which can at present be adopted with advantage in this colony. It should meet annually on the summons of the bishop, and should be regularly organized on certain principles, that its objects may be the better defined. Such an assembly would seat the bishop, yearly, in the midst of his clergy, like a father among his children, and thus realize the theory, if not the practice of the parent Church, which places the power of government in the clergy as well as in the bishop. In England, the bishops have always been elected (though now unhappily only in form) by the deans and chapters of their respective cathedrals, who were originally designed to be the standing council, or presbytery of the bishop, to advise and assist him in ordinations and deprivations, and censuring all grosser criminals, and defending the doctrine and discipline of the Church. And it is difficult to conceive an association more endearing, intimate, and effectual than this provision contemplated, when the spiritual father of his clergy called them around him as brethren in Christ, to consider how his glory might be promoted.

To the ancient civil constitution of England, as far back as Magna Charta, we are in the habit of appealing; and it is no less fair to make the same appeal to the antiquity of our venerable ecclesiastical fabric, in order to prove that its government has ever been by bishops and presbyters, and that to confine it exclusively to the former is repugnant to sound policy, scriptural rule, the genuine constitution of the Church of England, and the practice of the Christian Church in all ages. I venerate episcopacy, for it is apostolical, and with becoming reverence for the living, I profoundly honor that host, the angels of our Church, from the time of the martyrs to the venerable Secker, Porteus, and Lowth. It is, therefore, from no disrespect to the order, or to the men, for men they still are, however excellent in talent or sublime in piety, that I feel, that in England the bishops are at present permitted, in many cases, to exercise too great power over the clergy, while in others they are too much restrained by the civil courts; and that I urge the necessity of conforming, in this Province, to ancient usage, which required the bishop to do nothing material without the advice of his presbyters, and to hold frequent meetings with his clergy, to regulate the affairs of the Church.

In addition to the reasons already assigned for the immediate adoption of a provincial synod, I may notice the changes which have recently taken place in the parent Church, and the many others which are in contemplation and will certainly become laws. These will greatly alter her state and economy, and render this portion, to which they cannot extend altogether, anomalous, unless we possess the power of self-government. In our present state we can exercise little or no discipline, for the ecclesiastical law has never been extended to the colony, and without synods no customs or usages can grow up, or any power be exerted from an authority sufficiently recognised and respected, or indeed in any way, except in so far as the bishop may feel himself at liberty to act alone, a course of proceeding which could not be satisfactory either to the bishop or the members of the Church. The Diocesan Convocation, which to me seems the most desirable, should consist of the clergy having cure of souls, and a lay delegation of limited power, in no case extending to spiritual things, from each congregation, with the bishop to preside. I am aware that many estimable persons are unwilling to associate the laity in a scheme of ecclesiastical legislation, and think that in this respect our sister Church in the United States has fallen into a great error; but on this subject it may be remarked, that in primitive times the body of the people had a very considerable share in the determinations of the Church: the laity were present with the apostles and elders at the Council of Jerusalem, and were required to choose proper persons from among themselves to present to the apostles, and afterward to the bishops, for ordination, although they had no power of their own accord to appoint them to any sacred office. It is indeed admitted, that the laity were not allowed to sit in the councils or synods called by the emperors; but before their introduction they were a component part of the diocesan assemblies, and it is to this period of the Church that, in this Province, we wish to return; it suits better in every respect with our situation in this new and extensive region, where the scattered fragments of our communion are to be carefully and laboriously collected; but as the people could not, like those of the Church of Jerusalem and Antioch, act in a body, they must act through representatives. It may be further remarked, that the introduction of the laity is more than justified by the practice in England; for when the Convocation meets and provides for the state of religion, the measures which it adopts and the canons which it has prepared, must be ratified by the King, Lords, and Commons, before they become binding as laws of the realm. Moreover, by the statute of submission, (25 Henry VIII.) the Convocation can only be summoned by the king's writ; nor when met is it to enact, promulgate, or execute any new canons, constitutions, ordinances, provincial or other, unless the king's assent or license be had to make, promulgate, and execute the same.

Since the passing of the Submission Act it is ruled—

That a Convocation cannot assemble without the king's leave, nor, when assembled, confer or make canons without the royal license, much less put them in execution; and even with the king's license canons are void which are opposed to the king's prerogative, repugnant to the common or statute law, or contrary to any custom of the kingdom. In fine, the direct interference of the laity with the discipline and government of the Church in England is much greater than it is in the United States, and the advantages which it brings to the ecclesiastical polity of our neighbors are entirely lost in the mother country. By introducing the laity as a component part of the councils of the Church, episcopacy has become popular in the United States, and the long-cherished prejudices against bishops have not only vanished away, but they are acquiring among the people much of that respect and veneration which they enjoyed in the first ages of the Church. There is something gratifying in being associated with men holding an office so holy, and to which they are in general promoted from approved piety, learning, and ability, by the suffrages of their brethren the clergy. Without the business talents, and active energy of laymen, the Church assemblies would lose much of their authority. Few would submit to their decrees, and the great and increasing interest now taken in the proceedings of her conventions and convocations would soon cease to exist.

But it will be said that no convocation can be called in this Province without first obtaining the direct sanction of the king, for that by statute law, as well as ancient usage, his supremacy in things ecclesiastical is altogether absolute. On this point it may be observed, that it cannot be our desire, much less our duty, to act in disobedience to our sovereign; and were we to presume to enact rules and constitutions binding the community at large, we should be contravening his supremacy; but all that we desire is, that the bishop may annually convene his clergy and delegates of congregations in common council or synods, to transact such affairs respecting the Church as may be found necessary for its well being and extension. To such an assembly neither the supremacy of the king nor the Act of Submission offer any impediment, since it has respect to none but the members of our own communion.

In the opinion of the best authorities the supremacy does not extend to diocesan synods: even *Dr. Wake* admits that the bishop of each diocese has, by divine commission, a power of governing that portion of the Church of Christ over which he is placed, and to call together the presbyters which minister under him; and this was constantly held by the fathers and ancient councils of the Church: and indeed without such power, the bishop could not discharge the functions of his office.

BISHOP WHITE.

It is impossible to pass over in silence the death of a truly venerable prelate, who was, in so many respects, an object of deep interest in his life, and whose death was such as might be expected from such a man. The very advanced age of Bishop White, the very long period during which he had held his episcopal office, the soundness of his views, his zeal for the true interests of Christ's Church on earth, the unwearied energy with which, to the last, he continued to discharge his sacred functions, continued to attract the affectionate feelings and the veneration of all true Churchmen to him, while the fact, that he was one, and for some years the only survivor of those through whom the succession was given to America, excited a deep interest in all that concerned him. The truly Christian prelate, Bishop Doane, who attended his death-bed, and preached his funeral sermon, (a discourse full of true Christian feeling and catholic principles, as well as marked with all the excellent author's characteristic eloquence,) has given us, in an appendix, an account of his (Bishop White's) decline and death, which will be read with real satisfaction.

The Editor cannot help taking this opportunity of saying how strongly he hopes, ere long, to be able to give, from time to time, a short précis of the proceedings of the Church in America. It is a subject of the deepest interest to us. Nowhere are Church principles better understood, or more faithfully carried out. The last great resolution of the American Church—that the Church, *as a Church, and not by societies*, should be missionary; and that the Church should be sent, in the integrity of its powers, that is, with a bishop and presbyters, and not with presbyters only, to do the work of missions, whenever it undertakes that work,—is one of many proofs of this. The English mother must take that lesson, sooner or later, from her American daughter, if she would work with God's blessing on her. In many other particulars she might look, with great profit, to the same source for wholesome instruction.

Our American brethren will soon have many precious remembrances. They have now lost one whose patriarchal age and character, whose Christian principles and unwearied zeal will ever be referred to among them with love and veneration. In a prelate, called home at an earlier period, and in less advanced life, in Bishop Hobart, they lost one whom, alike for mental powers, for Christian graces, for unflinching courage, for perfect love of truth, for devotion to his Master's cause here below, for Christian humility, for the kindest heart and the warmest affections, the oldest and noblest branches of Christ's Church on earth might be proud to enrol among its most beloved and most sacred names.—*British Magazine.*

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

OPINIONS.

In this paper an examination is proposed of Laud's sentiments with regard to the use of private CONFESSION.

It was alleged in one of the articles of accusation preferred against the primate by the Scots commissioners, that "by comparing Canon 9, cap. 18, as it was sent in writing from our prelates, and as it is printed at Canterbury's command, may be also manifest, that he went about to establish auricular confession and Popish absolution." To which he replies, "I have showed before that this Book of Canons was not printed by my command. To the present charge I shall answer nothing, but only transcribe that canon, and leave it to the judgment of all orthodox and moderate Christians, whether I have therein gone about to establish *auricular confession* and *Popish absolution*. The canon is as follows: 'Albeit *sacramental confession* and *absolution* have been, in some places, very much abused, yet if any of the people be grieved in mind for any delict or offence committed, and, for the unburdening of his conscience, confess the same to the bishop or presbyter, they shall, as they are bound, minister to the person so confessing all spiritual consolations out of the word of God; and shall not deny him the benefit of *absolution*, after the manner which is prescribed in *the visitation of the sick*, if the party show himself truly penitent, and humbly desire to be absolved. And he shall not make known or reveal what hath been opened to him in confession, at any time, or to any person whatsoever, except the crime be such as, by the laws of the realm, his own life may be called in question for concealing the same."

"If there be here any thing to establish Popish confession or absolution, I humbly submit it to the learned of the Reformed Churches throughout Christendom: all men (for aught I yet know) allowing confession and absolution, as most useful for the good of Christians, and condemning only the binding of all men to confess all sins, upon absolute danger of salvation."

And this is a just statement of the question in dispute. "The Reformed Churches" admitted the authority and excellence of confession; but denied that it was "binding" upon "all men to confess all sins." Laud did not act without authority, for the provision had long since been made in the Church of England, and was recognised in her standards: he did not act without reason, for he was sustained by the use of the Church in all ages. He is not alone in his view of its importance, for many most learned and pious divines have supported the same. He is then sustained by,

1, *The Church of England.* The last rubric after the declaration of the articles of faith, in the visitation of the sick, is as follows:—

Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled by any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort: OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by his authority, committed unto me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST. So, too, in the exhortation to the communion, which concludes in this manner: "And because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy communion but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience, therefore, if there be any one of you who, by this means, cannot quiet his own conscience herein, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy word, he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness"

From a passage in one of Bishop Jeremy Taylor's works, it would appear that one of the canons of the Church of England provides for the regulation of private confession: but I have not met with the book.

2, *Antiquity.* The proofs below could be made much more numerous, if the limits of the article permitted. They may be found in Casalius de Vet. Sac. Christ. Rit cap. xxiv, and other authorities.

Origen (flor. A. D. 220) in Hom. 10 in Numb., "Laicus si peccet, ipse suum non potest auferre peccatum, sed indiget sacerdote, ut possit remissionem peccatorum accipere." The same father, in his seventh homily on Luke, "Si enim hoc fecerimus, et revelaverimus peccata nostra, non solum Deo; sed et his, qui possunt mederi vulneribus nostris atque peccatis; delebuntur peccata nostra ab eo, qui ait, ecce delebo, ut nubem, iniquitates tuas, et sicut caliginem peccata tua." (Lat ver. ex Taylor.)

S Cyprian, (flor. A. D. 240,) in lib. de lapsis:—"Confiteantur singuli, quæso vos fratres, delictum suum; dum adhuc, qui deliquit, in sæculo est, dum admitti ejus confessio potest; dum satisfactio, et remissio facta per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata est."

S. Basil (flor. A. D. 360,) in Regul. explic. et Reg. Brev. 228: Δεῖ τῶν τεταγμένων ἕκαστον μηδὲν μὲν τῆς ψυκῆς κίνημα ἀποκρυφον φυλάσσειν, ἀλλ' ἀπογυμνοῦν τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδιας τοῖς πιστευομενοις ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν ἀσθενουντῶν.

Ἀναγκαῖον ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τοῖς πεπιστευομένοις τὴν δικονομίαν τῶν μυσηρίων τοῦ Θεου.

S. Gregory M. (flor A. D. 590,) in hom. 26 in Octav. Paschæ, "Causæ pensandæ sunt, et eum ligandi atque solvendi potestas exercenda, videndum est, quæ culpa ante, quæ sit pænitentia sequuta post culpam: ut quos omnipotens Deus per compunctionis gratiam vivivicat, illos pastoris sententia absolvat: tunc enim vera est absolutio præsidentis, cum eterni arbitrium sequitur judices."

"For they who are spotted with sins, unless they be cured with the priestly authority, cannot be in the bosom of the Church," said Fabianus Martyr, (cited by Taylor.)

3. *Divines.* "When St. James exhorts all Christians 'to confess their sins to one another, certainly it is more agreeable to all spiritual ends that this be done rather to the curate of souls than to the ordinary brethren. The CHURCH OF ENGLAND is no way engaged against it, but advises it, and practises it. The CALVINIST churches did not practise it much, because they knew not well how to divest it from its evil appendages, which are put to it by the customs of the world, and to which it is too much exposed by the interests, weaknesses, and partialities of men. But, they commending it, show they would use it willingly, if they could order it unto edification. 'Interim quin sistant se pastori oves, quoties sacram cœnam participare volunt, adeo non reclamo, ut *maxime velim hoc ubique observari.*' Calvin. Inst. lib. iii. c. 4 sec. 12, 13. And for the LUTHERAN churches, that it is their practice, we may see it in Chemnitius, (2 Part. Exam. Concil, Trid. cap. 5, de Pænit.,) who was one of greatest fame amongst them; and he is noted to this purpose by Bellarmine; only they all consent that it is not necessary nor of divine institution." (Bp. Jer. Taylor, of Auricular Confession.)

"Confession to a priest, the minister of pardon and reconciliation, the curate of souls, and the guide of consciences, is of so great use and benefit to all that are heavy laden with their sins, that they who carelessly and causelessly neglect it, are neither lovers of the peace of consciences, nor are careful for the advantage of their souls" (Bp. Jer. Taylor, of the Doctrine and Practice of Repentance, chap. x. sec. 4.) "For the publication of our sins to the minister of holy things, τουτον ἔχει τὸν λόγον, ὃν ἔχει ἡ ἐπίδειξις τῶν σωματικῶν παθῶν, said Basil, (Regul. Brev 229,) is just like the manifestation of the diseases of our body to the physician, for God hath appointed them as spiritual physicians." (Taylor, ut supra.)

It is asserted by Bishop Taylor, "that in the primitive Church there was no such thing as a judicial absolution of sins used in any liturgy or church, as far as can appear" He considers "that the priest's proper power of absolving, that is, of pardoning, is a giving the penitent the means of eternal pardon, the admitting him to the sacraments of the Church, and the peace and communion of the faithful, merely declarative:" and that its intention is not different in any part of the Church.

The writer has attempted a task requiring a much greater acquaintance with authorities than he possesses; yet he believes *in as far as he has investigated* his subject, the proofs are satisfactory; and he has given nothing more. PHILARCHÆUS.

Boston, December 17, 1836.

P S It has startled many an honest Independent, who by chance has got hold of an original work of sturdy John Calvin, or Martin Luther, when in some well-prized "commentarie," some latent passage of "The Institutions," he has encountered sly admissions, well guarded by cautious ifs, and left to their own fate without defence or apology, yet savoring much of ancient heresy. And, in the honesty of his ignorance, he has exclaimed, as he returned the dusty volume to its shelf,—Great Calvin! much learning hath made thee mad. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants. Where have been Protestants as consistent as the Covenanters and the Puritans? Assigning to Rome the whole body of Christian testimony, experience, and wisdom; outspreading, in one hand, the broad banner of private opinion; coolly hanging and burning their brother-democrats with the other; extolling Protestantism as the religion of the enlightened; fairly proving it the religion of the ignorant.

And who are they that the bigoted "no bigot" points at, "Romanists," "Papishers," "near neighbors to the Babylon of abominations," they are men who have devoted their lives to the study of the legitimate authorities of doctrine and rite: Laud and Montague; not —— ——. P.

For the Churchman.

A CHRISTMAS ADDRESS.

Jesus had displayed his divine power in the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead. By reason of this, says St. John, many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus. He had concealed himself for a time from fear of the rulers; but as the great festival of the passover approached, he was eagerly looked for by the people. Having passed a day at Bethany, with the family of Lazarus, "On the next day, *much people that were come to the feast, when they heard that* Jesus *was coming to Jerusalem, took branches of palm trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried, Hosanna! Blessed is the King of Israel, that cometh in the name of the* Lord!"

The mode of this reception was derived by the Jews from the feast of tabernacles, one of the principal Hebrew festivals. Of the institution of this feast, the following account is given in the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus: "When ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast to the Lord seven days; and ye shall take you on the first day the *boughs of goodly trees, branches of palm trees, and the boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook;* and ye shall rejoice before the Lord seven days—ye shall *dwell in booths* seven days: all that are Israelites born shall dwell in booths, that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God." Authors who were conversant with the history and practice of the Jews say, that, during the continuance of this feast, they carried *in their hands branches of palm, olive, citron, myrtle, and willow trees, singing, Hosanna! Save, I beseech thee! Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the* Lord!" a form of prayer taken from the hundred and eighteenth Psalm; in which they expressed their desire for the coming of the Messiah. The branches, which were called *hosannas*, and were frequently tied with bands of gold and silver, or with ribbands, were not laid aside for the whole day. During the continuance of the feast, they walked in procession round the altar, with the branches in their hands, amidst the sound of trumpets, singing the Hosanna. When Nehemiah restored the legal polity and worship of the Jews, we are told by him, in his eighth chapter, that he restored the observance of this festival, which had been intermitted from the time of Joshua And in the Apocryphal book of the *Maccabees* (2 Mac. x 6) we read, that when that heroic and patriotic family had succeeded, through the providence of God, in delivering Judea from the blasphemous and barbarous nations, they kept the days in which they cleansed the temple with gladness, as in the feast of tabernacles, "*Therefore they bare branches*, and *fair boughs*, and *palms, also;* and *sang psalms* unto Him that hath given them good success."

We may thus see that the believing Jews, who conducted Jesus into Jerusalem, considering him to be the promised Messiah, expressed their great joy at finding in him the accomplishment of those petitions which they had so often offered to God for the coming of the Messiah, at the feast of tabernacles. This is a sufficient authority for our welcoming the return of the anniversary of his coming with *the boughs of goodly trees.* But an attentive reader of the Scriptures will find much more than this.

Of the variety of imagery which the prophets use to prefigure the glorious era that should commence with the birth of Immanuel, and the future happiness and prosperity of his Church, none is more frequent, beautiful, and appropriate than that presented by the trees of the forest A pious writer has very justly remarked, that "when the prophets have occasion to foretel the marvellous change to be effected in the moral world, under the evangelical dispensation, they frequently borrow their ideas from the history of that garden in which innocence and felicity once dwelt together, and which they represent as again springing up and blooming in the wilderness: such joy and gladness, such thanksgiving and melody, are described as taking place at the restitution of all things, as were shown at their first creation, 'when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy.'"

How beautiful are the emblems of the Christian Church contained in the fifty-fifth of Isaiah, "*All the trees of the field* shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the *fir tree;* and instead of the brier shall come up the *myrtle tree;* and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." The brier and thorn not only represent the dejected and forlorn state of the Jewish Church during the age which immediately preceded the Saviour's advent, but also the unfruitful works of heathen darkness. And the *fir tree* and *myrtle*, which should come up instead thereof, beautifully represent the flourishing and ever-during nature of the kingdom of the Messiah; the anticipation of which to the Jews was most pleasing It was also the general impression of the Gentile world, at that period, that a mighty Discoverer and Prince should arise, who would restore that *golden age* which their poets and philosophers had frequently and beautifully described. The prophet in this passage points to the omnipotence of God, who would infallibly accomplish his word, and bring about those glorious deliverances which he had promised. And his description is a lively picture of that happy change to be produced in the world by the Gospel

Again; in his representation of the glory that should come upon the Church by the access of the Gentiles, on the opening of the gospel dispensation, Isaiah says, (chap lv.,) "*The glory of Lebanon* shall come unto thee, the *fir tree, the pine tree, and the box tree* together, to beautify the *place of my sanctuary*, and I will make the place of my feet glorious" You may now see around you some of the emblems which the prophet made use of to represent the hallowed season of redemption. God's sanctuary is beautified, the place of his feet is made glorious, by the emblems which his own prophets chose to set forth his wonderful designs. Instead of the *thorn* and *brier*, we behold the goodly boughs of the *glory of Lebanon*—incorruptible and fragrant *cedar, the pine tree* and the *box.* May they be to us an emblem of that salvation which shall be for ever, and that righteousness which shall not be abolished!

Further; when God, by his prophet, exhorted his Church to trust in him, for her encouragement, he says, "I will plant in the wilderness (that is, in the world) the *cedar*, the *myrtle*, and the *oil tree.* I will set in the desert the *fir tree*, and the *pine*, and the *box tree* together; that they may see, and know, and consider, and understand together, that the hand of the Lord hath done this, and the holy One of Israel hath created it." We are certainly to understand by these expressions the union of people of different nations in the Church of Christ the garden of the Lord, which he has purchased with his own blood: when the whole earth, indeed, shall become one fold, under one Shepherd.

Hail! glorious day, expected long,
When Jew and Greek one prayer shall pour,
With eager feet one temple throng
With grateful praise one God adore.

The Psalmist, in speaking of the Church of the Redeemer, beautifully compares her to *a vine:* "Thou hast brought *a vine* out of Egypt; thou hast cast out the heathen and planted it, and didst cause it to take deep root, and it filled the land. The hills were covered with the shadow of it, and the boughs thereof were like the goodly cedars She sent out her *boughs* unto the sea, and her branches unto the rivers." This is literally true of the Jewish Church, or nation, who, under the special protection of God, increased mightily in Egypt, and were afterward put in possession of Palestine, a country surrounded by the sea, and rivers; from which the heathen inhabitants were cast out to make room for them. But the great excellence of the Psalmist's figure consists in its being an emblem of the prosperity and glory of the Christian Church. The Psalmist might have been looking through the vista of prophecy on that glorious hour when the ascending Redeemer commissioned his apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature, or on that day yet to come when his religion shall triumph in every land, from the river to the ends of the earth,—when the banners of the Cross shall be hailed as the rallying points of nations,—when the glory of Lebanon shall be as extensive as it is durable, and its shade and its fragrance shall refresh every fainting heart. How glorious will be that day! when all the false fires of paganism shall be for ever extinguished! when every idolater shall cast his idols to the moles and the bats! when to Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father!

The trees which the sacred writers have made choice of as emblems of the prosperity of the Church of the Redeemer, are very significant, moreover, on account of their *continual verdure.* They are not like most other trees, withered by the cold, and blasts, and storms of winter. Their beauty and grandeur remain, when all the other foliage around them is in its sere and yellow leaf, or wholly passed away. They even seem by contrast to have acquired a brighter hue, and a more vivid vegetation. It is this circumstance which makes them a livelier representation of the perennial mercy of God, and, of course, more appropriate emblems of his Church, which has stood from the foundation of the world, and which, because founded on the word of God, like that shall stand and flourish for ever!

But of all the trees of the forest, the *cedar* is most celebrated in Scripture, and is therefore the most apt emblem of the durability and final triumph of the Church. It shoots out many large branches, it is always green, and in the East produces a gum to which different valuable effects have been attributed. Its wood is incorruptible, beautiful to the eye, fragrant to the smell, and solid. The Psalmist as above stated, speaking of the wonderful protection which God had extended to the Jewish Church, compares it to a vine which covered the hills with its shadow, and the boughs thereof were like the goodly *cedars*, intimating that its condition was highly flourishing; and when Isaiah would describe the outbreaking which the increase that the same Church should receive under the gospel dispensation should produce, he says, "The *glory of Lebanon* shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon." David also describes the prosperity of the pious man by a similar figure: "The righteous shall flourish like the *palm tree:* he shall grow like a *cedar in Lebanon.*"

Without the joyful anticipations which the Gospel yields, what a waste, a wilderness, would this world be! Yes, with all its transitory pleasures, with all its fading delights. For what is there in the best of them, in them all, to satisfy an immortal soul? To give strength, and courage, and faith, and buoyancy, to the spirit just about to be called away from flesh and sense? Who, as his great and dreaded change approaches, when he is to take leave of all that he has known, and plunge into a fathomless, and to him perhaps dark, and unknown futurity, does not wish a stronger stay, a firmer hope, a more enduring satisfaction, than they can give? And have we, my friends, a proper sense of our own unworthiness and guilt; and do we feel the absolute necessity of the Redeemer's grace and merits to reconcile us to God? Must we not believe then that he is so fair in his greatness, and in the length of his branches, that "the *cedars in the garden* of God could not hide him; the fir trees are not like his boughs, nor any tree in the garden of God, like him in his beauty." (Ezekiel xxxi. 8. See also chap. xvii. 23.) In the greatness of his shadow we may trust for shelter and relief in the day of adversity—from the storms of passion, from worldly sorrows, and the shipwreck of worldly hopes—looking confidently to that glorious home of the righteous in the world above, toward which *the cedar*, with its tapering head, ever points, as if purposely to make the figure complete, and furnish a plain analogy.

How proper, then, that when we celebrate the coming of the Messiah, the only hope of a sinful and perishing world, we should borrow from the word of the Most High his own beautiful analogy, and plant within the Church, the sign that she shall be everlasting, a crown of glory, and a diadem of beauty! Did the Church of old, because of the anticipation of her future splendor by the coming of the Messiah, beautify the sanctuary with the *glory of Lebanon. the fir tree. the pine tree* and *the box tree;* and shall we, who, by testimonials most sure, can look back and see some of her predicted glories fulfilled, refrain from thus beautifying his temple, and the Church we love?

In thus directing your minds to the uses which prophecy has made of these emblems, and to the recollections which, as memorials, they should produce in us, let us remember that we are called to exhibit pious joy in the confirmation of our faith, and the strengthening of our hope. We here see emblematically displayed, the beauty, the prosperity, and the happiness of the Church Let us also see, by anticipation, the glorious hour, when the faith of Jesus shall be spread throughout the world. With this glorious prospect, and with faith in the promises of God, we may exclaim with David, "*Let the field* be joyful, and all that is in it; then shall all the *trees of the wood* rejoice before the Lord:" and if inanimate nature shall thus rejoice, may we not call upon all animated nature to follow such an example, and say with David, *Let every thing that hath breath praise the* Lord?

THE CHURCHMAN.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1837.

TERMS.

Two dollars and fifty cents, if paid in advance, or three dollars if at the end of the year.

The Real Presence.—We have gained our point with the Editor of the Catholic Herald. Our standards affirm the doctrine of the REAL PRESENCE of Christ in the eucharist The Catholic Herald says that the members of our Church do not believe it, and that therefore our standards are *deceptive.* We answer, the charge of deception is a *calumny*, and therefore, unless you can *prove* that we do not believe in the real presence, you are guilty of a calumny. The Editor has tried his best, but has not advanced a solitary proof of his assertion Nor can he: for the truth is, that we do believe in the real presence to the full extent which the Catechism asserts it. We have therefore gained our point, and proved upon him the calumny.

But in all this we have had in view a much more important aim than any which concerns the Editor of the Catholic Herald. We wish our readers to understand the Roman Catholic controversy We wish them to know the specific errors by which the Romanists have violated the unity of the Catholic Church, and by adhesion to which they still remain in a state of schism. For want of this *exact* knowledge, Protestants, while indistinctly aiming at the errors of the Roman Church, are apt to hit the truths with which they are linked; and when they hear *these truths* defended they are instantly silenced, and perhaps astonished to find that Roman Catholics can say so much for their faith! Surely, however, it it no wonder that Roman Catholics can argue well for the *truth:* this is an evidence of the defensibleness, not of the *Roman*, but the *Christian* faith. But let the Protestant, in his objections to the Church of Rome, specify the precise error to which he objects, disentangling it from the truth with which it is intertwined, and then if the Romanists argue well for their error, he may with more reason credit their faith with strength, and its champions with ability

For instance: the Protestant is asked why he cannot communicate with the Church of Rome, and his first answer, we will suppose, is, that he cannot do so without incurring the guilt of idolatry; as a proof of which he points to the adoration of the host What! rejoins the Romanist, charge us with idolatry! Be assured we are not guilty of a sin so gross and flagrant: we adore our divine Redeemer, whom we believe to be present in the sacrament: how unfair, then, how unchristian, to charge us with idolatry! Hereupon the inexperienced Protestant is struck dumb, and concludes, in the simplicity of his heart, that the Roman faith has been misunderstood by Protestants, and most foully calumniated.

How is this? Has the Protestant indeed been nursed in prejudices? Have the martyrs of the Church of England bled in attestation of a calumny? Have the illustrious divines of that Church been either so ignorant, or so wicked, as to disseminate among the people such false and empty charges, as may thus be blown away by a breath? No man, with a due regard for the character of himself and his Church, would harbor this thought without the weightiest reasons. Reasons, however, he would not find: a little inquiry would convince him that the charge which he had brought rested on the most solid grounds, but that he himself had failed in its specification, or rather in knowing exactly wherein consisted the truth of the charge.

The well informed Protestant would have seen at once that the denial above ascribed to the Romanists was in truth no denial, but a mere evasion. The point of the charge was, that Romanists were guilty of idolatry in adoring the *host* or *sacrament:* the answer is, that they adore Christ, who is present in the sacrament. If this answer contained the whole truth, then we of the Protestant Episcopal Church might well be silent: for we believe in the real presence as well as the Romanists; nay, we believe, as well as they, that Christ is to be adored in the eucharist The Editor of the Catholic Herald denies that we believe in the real presence, and when he sees us affirm that we believe in the adoration of Christ in the eucharist, he will probably quadruple his notes of exclamation. Still it is true; and as he has failed in proving the negative, we shall increase his perplexity by proving the affirmative.

Our first proof is the words of the Catechism, viz, that "the inward part or thing signified in the sacrament is the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." On this passage the Editor of the Catholic Herald well remarks, that for a thing to be taken and received argues that it must be *present* where it is taken and received. Hence the passage asserts that the body and blood of Christ are *present* in the sacrament. Moreover, argues the Editor of the Herald, if they are "verily and indeed" present, then they are "really" present. True, say we, and this shows that the Editor of the Herald takes the word *really* as synonymous with *verily.* Mark that.

The communion office contains several expressions to the same effect. Thus we thank "Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that he hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, *but to be our spiritual food and sustenance*" But if Christ be not really present to our souls, how can he be their food and sustenance?

Again, "For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament, (for then we *spiritually eat the flesh of* Christ *and drink his blood; then we dwell in* Christ *and he in us: we be one with* Christ *and he with us.*) So is the danger great," &c.

Church of England Office.

"Grant us therefore so to eat the flesh and drink the blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood.

"Beseeching thee that we and all others who shall be partakers of this holy communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, &c.

"And when the priest delivereth the bread he shall say: The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life: take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

"Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee that *thou dost vouchsafe to feed us*, who have duly received these holy mysteries, *with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour* Jesus Christ"

All these passages plainly assert or imply the belief that Christ is really present to the faithful in the Lord's supper.

Our Church also prescribes the divine worship of Christ, not merely of his divinity, but of his human nature, in virtue of its personal union with the divine. We do not adore the humanity alone, nor the divinity alone, but we adore Jesus Christ, comprehending the *two natures* in *one person.* Of this the litany affords abundant proof. She also directs the body and blood of Christ to be delivered to the communicants "devoutly kneeling," which is the posture of adoration. If, then, she expects us to adore Christ in the other offices of the Church, how much in that sublime communion in which he is especially present, and in which she carefully prescribes the peculiar attitude of adoration!

As the Church, then, teaches the real presence, no less does she sanction the adoration of Christ in the eucharist.

But, says the Catholic Herald, this is sheer deception: the divines of your Church believe no such thing. We have called for the proof of this negation in vain, and now proceed to fortify the affirmative by quotations from such standard divines as we happen to have at hand.

First, we adduce the greatest name of the Anglican Reformation, the teacher of Cranmer, and all the Reformers, Nicolas Ridley. In Ridley's Life of Ridley, p. 216, we read, "The idolatrous veneration of that sacrament [the Lord's supper] in the Church of Rome, in worshipping the elements, as converted into the very substantial and natural body and blood of Christ, and the extreme reverence paid to them by the Lutherans, as comprehending and containing the same substantial and natural body and blood, were now openly exposed: but the Anabaptists, who fled from Germany hither; the extravagant among ourselves, who leap from one extreme, over the truth, to the other; and some Protestants, who confounded truth and error by their scurrility, carried this opposition so far as to bring the sacrament into great contempt. Railing bills against it were fixed upon the doors of St. Paul's Cathedral, and other places, terming it, *Jack in a box, the sacrament of the halter. Round Robin*, and such irreverend terms. The new Bishop of Rochester [Ridley] set his face strenuously against this impiety; and publicly rebuked it in his sermon, at St. Paul's Cross, this November, with great earnestness asserting the dignity of the sacrament, and the Presence of Christ's body there. Reproving with great freedom those who did irreverently behave themselves with regard to it; bidding them who esteemed the sacrament no better than a piece of bread, to depart, as unworthy to hear the mystery; as the *Pœnitentes. Audientes, Catechumeni, Energumeni*, in the primitive times were not admitted when the sacrament was administered. Observing to them (as Feckman reports that the divil believed better than some among them; for he believed that Christ was able *of stones to make bread*, but they would not believe that Christ's body was in the sacrament; but to the receivers (the *sancti*) he so explained the presence, that he asserted, that the material substance of the bread did still remain, and that Christ called it his body, meat and flesh, giving it the properties of the thing of which it beareth the name."

The whole of this passage deserves to be studied by the reader. In particular, let him observe that the idolatry of the Romanist is said to consist, not in worshipping Christ in the sacrament, but in worshipping the *elements as converted* into the body and blood of Christ: that the presence of Christ's body is twice affirmed, and that the sacramental bread and wine are said to possess the *properties* of the body and blood of Christ, yet so that the material substance of bread and wine remains.

To the same effect, in his conference with the Bishop of Lincoln: "To rebuke the unreverend behavior of certain evil-disposed persons, I preached as reverently of that matter [the sacrament] as I might, declaring what reverence ought to be given to it, what danger ensued the mishandling thereof; affirming *in that sacrament to be truly and verily the body and blood of* Christ"—*Ridley's Life of Ridley*, p. 610.

Cranmer, in his answer to Gardiner, as quoted by Archbishop Wake, in reply to the charge that he denied the real presence, says, "My book in divers places saith clean contrary, that Christ is with us spiritually present, is eaten and drunk of us, and dwelleth within us, although corporeally he be departed out of this world, and gone into heaven. As he giveth bread to be eaten with our mouths, so he giveth his *very body* to be eaten with our faith: and therefore I say that Christ giveth himself *truly to be eaten. chawed, and digested*, but all is spiritually, with faith, not with mouth."

Thus Bishop Jewell: "We affirm that Christ doth truly and presently give himself wholly in his sacraments; * * in his supper, that we may eat him by faith and spirit. and may have everlasting life by his cross and blood. And we say not this is done slightly or coldly, but effectually and truly. For although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold him fast by faith, by understanding, and by spirit. * * * Christ himself altogether is so offered and given us in these mysteries, that we may certainly be assured that we be 'flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone,' and that 'Christ continueth in us, and we in him.'"—*Jewell's Apology*, sect. 14.

And again, in his reply to Harding, "Whereas Mr. Harding thus unjustly reporteth of us that we maintain a *naked figure*, and a *bare sign.* or *token only.* and nothing else: he knoweth well we feed not the people of God with bare signs and figures, but teach them that the sacraments of Christ be holy mysteries, and that in the ministration thereof Christ is set before us, even as he was crucified upon the cross. We teach the people, not that a naked *sign* or *token*, but that Christ's *body and blood indeed and verily* is given unto us, that we *verily eat it*, that we *verily drink it*, that we verily be relieved and live by it; that we are bones of his bones, and flesh of his flesh; that Christ dwelleth in us, and we in him."

Hooker, book v. sect. 67, says, "Evident it is how they [the ancient fathers] teach that Christ is personally there [in the eucharist] present, yea, present whole, albeit a part of Christ be corporally absent from thence: that Christ assisting this heavenly banquet with his personal and true presence, doth, by his own divine power, add to the natural substance thereof supernatural efficacy, which addition to the nature of those consecrated elements changeth them, and maketh them that unto us which otherwise they could not be, that to us they are thereby made such instruments, as mystically yet truly, invisibly yet really, work our communion or fellowship with the person of Jesus Christ, as well in that he is man as God, our participation also in the fruit, grace, and efficacy of his body and blood: whereupon there ensueth a kind of transubstantiation in us, a true change both of body and soul, an alteration from death to life"

Bishop Stillingfleet, in his treatise entitled, "The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented," says, (chap. v.) "The question is not whether Christ may be lawfully adored by us in the celebration of the eucharist; *which we are so far from denying, that our Church requires us to receive it in the posture of adoration.*"[*]

Bishop Cosins, in his Digest of the Points of Difference and Agreement between the Churches of England and Rome, says that both agree: "In acknowledging his [Christ's] sacramental, spiritual, true, and real presence there [in the eucharist] to the souls of all them that come faithfully and devoutly to receive him according to his own institution in that holy sacrament."

Bishop Hall, in his "Explication of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament," says, "That Christ Jesus our Lord is truly present and received in the blessed sacrament of his body and blood, is so clear and universally agreed upon, that he can be no Christian that doubts it."

Bishop Bull, in his second letter to Bossuet, after quoting the Catechism and the communion office of the Prayer-book, says, "These are the words of our Church; and the meaning is clearly this: Christ is *really* present in this sacrament, inasmuch as they who worthily receive it have thereby *really conveyed to them our Saviour* Christ, and all the benefits of that body and blood whereof the bread and wine are the outward signs."

Bishop Taylor, in his Treatise on the Real Presence, says, "The doctrine of the Church of England is, that, after the minister hath rightly prayed and blessed or consecrated the bread and wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ after a sacramental, i. e., in a spiritual, real manner. So that all who worthily communicate do by faith receive Christ really, effectually to all the purposes of his passion. It is bread, and it is Christ's body; it is bread in substance, Christ in the sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed as these symbols are."

Bishop Andrews says, "We adore not the sacrament, yet we adore Christ in and with the sacrament; besides and without the sacrament."

Bishop Burnet concludes his explanation of the Twenty-eighth Article thus: "By which we assert a *real presence* of the body and blood of Christ; but not of his body as it is now glorified in heaven, but of his body as it was broken on the cross, when his blood was shed and separated from it."

Here, one would think, are abundant testimonies to prove the belief of our divines in the real presence. But, says the Catholic Herald, "The question is, Did they *believe* the doctrine, and not did they PROFESS to believe it." Out upon such trash! Men who laid down their lives at the stake were not the men to profess one thing and believe another. They professed the real presence, and they believed in the real presence; but they neither professed nor believed a doctrine whose ineffable absurdity and hideousness its blushing advocates would fain hide from view under a specious and respectable name.

All the writers above quoted were staunch opponents of the Church of Rome, all charged home upon her the sin of SCHISM with the Catholic Church, in consequence of her idolatrous terms of communion. Now the question is, what is the precise point in which they differed from that Church, and on which they grounded their charge of idolatry? Not the belief in the real presence, for that they firmly held: not the adoration of Christ in the eucharist, for that they freely yielded. As the Bishop of Durham (Cosins) has been claimed by the Editor of the Herald as symbolizing with Rome, in consequence of his profound knowledge of antiquity! (Risum teneatis, amici?) let him be the first to state the point of difference. The article of *agreement* we have quoted above: the article of *disagreement* is as follows: "That in the sacrament of the eucharist, the *whole substance of the bread* is converted into the *substance* of Christ's body, and the whole *substance* of wine into his blood, so truly and properly, as that, after consecration, there is neither any bread nor wine remaining there, which they call transubstantiation, and impose upon all persons under pain of damnation to be believed."

Let Bishop Taylor state the difference: "The question is not, whether the symbols be changed into Christ's body and blood, or no? for it is granted on all sides: but whether this conversion be sacramental and figurative, or whether it be natural and bodily? Nor is it whether Christ be taken really, but whether he be taken in a spiritual or in a natural manner? We say the conversion is *figurative, mysterious. and sacramental;* they say it is *proper, natural, and corporeal.* We affirm that Christ is really taken by *faith*, by the spirit to all real effects of his passion: they say he is taken by the *mouth*, and that the spiritual and the virtual taking him in virtue or effect is not sufficient, though done also in the sacrament. Hic Rhodus, hic Saltus."

Let Bishop Stillingfleet state the point at issue. In the sentence next to that above quoted from him, he says:

"The true question is, Whether the body of Christ, being supposed to be present in the host by transubstantiation, be a sufficient ground to give the same adoration to the host, which they would do to the person of Christ?"

Let Ridley state our faith, (Ridley's Life of Ridley, p 620.) "In the sacrament is a certain change, whereby that bread which was before common bread, is now made a lively representation of Christ's body; and is *not only a figure*, but effectuously representeth his body, that even as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of Christ's body, which the eye of faith seeth, as the bodily eye seeth only bread. Such a sacramental mutation I grant to be in the bread and wine; which truly is no small change, *but such a change as no mortal man can make, but only that* OMNIPOTENCY *of* Christ's *word.*"

Thus under his trial spake the holy martyr to the Bishop of Lincoln, and now let him state the grievous heresy which brought him to the stake: "Notwithstanding this sacramental mutation, which all the doctors confess, the true *substance* and *nature* of bread and wine *remaineth*, with which the body is, in like sort, nourished, as the soul is by grace and spirit with the body of Christ. Even so in baptism, the body is washed with the visible water, and the soul is cleansed from all filth by the invisible Holy Ghost; and yet the water ceaseth not to be water, but keepeth the nature of water still. In like manner, in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, *the bread ceaseth not to be bread.*"

Here, then, is the error of the Church of Rome: not that she teaches her children that Christ is really present in the eucharist, but that he is *so* present that the *substance of bread and wine no longer exists*, and that THE SUBSTANCE which we take in our *mouth*, chew with our *teeth*, mix with our *spittle*, and swallow into our *stomachs*, is not in any sense bread and wine, but is the living flesh and blood, the proper and natural body and soul, humanity and divinity of the adorable Saviour God blessed for ever.

And herein consists her idolatry; not that she teaches the adoration of Christ *in* the sacrament: for that we hold as well as they: but that she teaches the adoration of the SACRAMENT ITSELF.[*] "She would have us adore that very thing which is placed in the paten and upon the altar, and which the priest takes in his hand, and lifts up to be seen of the people." *That substance* which all our senses declare to be material bread and wine, she teaches her children to adore. We say that the *substance* of the symbols is material bread and wine. This substance we refuse to adore, and we say that all that do adore it, however they may fancy they are adoring Christ, are, in reality, adoring bread and wine, and therefore are idolaters.

Let all true Catholics bear in mind these distinctions, and then in their controversies with Romanists they will stand on terra firma, and prove upon their opponents the dreadful charge of exacting *sinful terms of communion.*

---

[*] The authority of Peter Du Moulin, a continental divine, was not pertinent in the body of the argument, but we may be allowed, in a note, to subjoin an extract from his "Defence of the Catholicke Faith contained in the Booke of the most Mightie and most Gracious King James the First, against the answere of N. Coeffeteau Generall of the Dominican Friars."

"The Confession of the King's Booke doth place among the new inuentions of the Church of Rome,

"*The Adoration of the Host, and the elevation which is made to have it adored.*"

This poynt is important, and which doth surprise our spirit with a heauinesse mixt with horrour when at the sound of a little bell, the Priest lifteth up the breade, and euery man prostrateth himselfe to adore it: or when the people doth not let to kneele down in the dyrt to adore their God, which passeth along the street, inclosed in a pixe or boxe. It had beene greatly therefore to have beene wished that Coeffeteau could have produced some commandment of God for the same, or some example of the apostles: but that he could not do, nor hath any man done it hereunto.

"He cometh therefore to the Fathers and produceth for the same three passages, the one of Chrysostome, the other of S. Ambrose, and the last of S. Austin. All three exhort the faithful to adore the flesh of Jesus Christ, and that which is more, to adore him in the eucharist.

"Never did man more abuse his reader, and he seemeth to thinke that we are beside our selves. for is there any thing in all this which we do not willingly graunt him? Is there any amongst us who hath euer denied, that wee ought to adore the flesh of Jesus Christ? Yea, who hath ever doubted that wee ought to adore him in the eucharist? Ought not God THE FATHER also to be adored? And what is this to the purpose to inclose Jesus Christ under formes? *He that doth adore* Jesus Christ *in the eucharist, doth not for al that adore that which the priest holdeth in his hand, but he adoreth* Jesus Christ *which is in heaven,*"

Similar quotations, if space allowed, might here be adduced from Beza, Calvin, Œlocompadius, and other continental Reformers, going to show that the divines not only of the Anglican Church, but of the Reformed Churches generally, understood themselves too well, at least on this vital subject, to abjure one title of the primitive Catholic faith, in their opposition to the novelties of the Roman creed. They *protested* neither against the real presence nor the adoration of Christ in the eucharist, but simply against that form of idolatry which they denominated "Bread worship" Indeed it is very doubtful whether Zuinglius himself, who is the reputed father of the loose views of the sacraments, current among our modern sects, really entertained the principles which are ascribed to him. We express this opinion on the authority of Archbishop Wake, who sustains it by pertinent quotations.

[*] Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christiani fideles, pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper recepto, latriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant: neque enim ideo minus est adorandum, quod fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur, institutum. Sessio xiii. cap. 5, Concil. Trident.

"There remains then no room to doubt," says the Council of Trent, on the eucharist, chap. 5, "that all Christ's faithful people should pay *to this most holy sacrament* in their veneration, the worship of latria, which is due to the true God, according to the custom which the Catholic Church has always received: nor is *it* therefore the less to be adored, because it was instituted by the Lord Christ that it might be received."

The question may be asked, since Anglican Catholics believe in the real presence, how comes the term to be chiefly used by the Roman Catholics? Why the latter are partial to it we have seen: it serves to hide their distinguishing error under the cover of a sublime scriptural truth. Why the former have suffered it to fall into *popular* disuse (we say *popular*, for in the writings of theologians the expression has always been current) we may learn from Bishop Burnet, who says, "We acknowledge a *real presence* of Christ in the sacrament, though we are convinced that our first Reformers judged right concerning the use of the phrase "real presence," that it were better to be let fall than to be continued, since the use of it and that idea which does naturally arise from the common acceptation of it may stick deeper and feed superstition more than all those larger explanations that are given to it can be able to cure." Now that the Reformers judged right in surrendering the phrase in their age may be very true, and it may be equally true that if they lived in the present age, they would judge right to resume it. Then the people were addicted to superstition, and the greatest care was necessary to restrain them from taking the words in the most gross and carnal sense. Then the vulgar adored the sacrament, and the learned justified the homage. Now the times are changed, and their tendencies reversed. The Reformers have triumphed; the people are emancipated from the ignominious thraldom that doomed them to disbelieve their senses under pain of eternal damnation, and the theologians of Rome are driven to tax their ingenuity to disguise, soften, modify, and, if possible, conceal an error which a cabal of Italian priests, yceleped "The Universal! Council of Trent," have hung, like a millstone, about their necks. Thanks to God and the martyrs, the world *is* reformed, and Rome herself inwardly sighs for the Reformation which England has effected. We fear not, therefore, the phrase which was once so hazardous: it needs not now the large explanations which were once necessary to guard it from misapprehension: we may now throw ourselves on the intelligence of the people without fear of their being abused by the grossest dogma that was ever palmed on human credulity, even if the advocates of that dogma were not now ashamed, as happily they are, to defend it with the "species," "forms," "accidents," and other subtleties of the metaphysical Erebus in the womb of which it was engendered. Of our own Churchmen at least we are sure: to them the phrase as well as the doctrine is far from novel: they find it in the writings of their Hobart, and they hear it from the lips of their soundest preachers.

Exclusiveness.—The charge of "exclusiveness" and "exclusive principles" has long been the stereotyped calumny with which the adversaries of the Church have attempted to throw odium on her best friends and ablest divines. Two hundred years ago good Bishop Sanderson said, in his homely way, "The cry is of late revived again, with more noise and malice than ever, in a world of base and unworthy pamphlets, that, like the frogs of Egypt, croak in every corner of the land; and I pray God the suffering of them to multiply into such heaps do not cause the whole land so to stink in his nostrils that he grow weary of it, and forsake us." For a long time we have heard almost nothing of the charge, and we had begun to indulge the hope that we had fairly lived it down. But while the harsh dissonance is dying on our ears "the cry is revived again," and a member of our own Church—a minister, it may be, at her altars joins in the croaking concert, and eagerly offers to throw himself on the last of the Egyptian heaps, and expire in its loathsome putrescence.

The writer referred to commenced with an assault on us for our review of "Protestant Jesuitism," and thought to show the futility of all we had written by apprising us that there were many "voluntary societies" in our own Church. We pointed out, in reply, the distinction between *voluntary* and *irresponsible*, referring for an example of the latter to the Education Society, which gave birth to Bristol College. After that the said writer was *dumb* on this subject, and forthwith shot off in a tangent to prove the danger resulting to the Church from the maintenance of "exclusive principles." In this work we did not mean to disturb him. He professed to be "a humble individual," and we had no objection that he should write himself into notoriety. He had shown a felicitous taste in the choice of an "attitude," and we were willing that he should stand in it unmolested, and "bay the moon," till he sank from pure exhaustion. We should, therefore, have been silent had "S. H. T.," (for it is none other than he,) confined himself within those general limits, which prudence and propriety should have taught him to observe. But when this writer goes from *principles* to *persons*; when not content to act the Yahoo at large, he seeks to gratify his propensities at the expense of civilized society; when, after gathering a cloud of odium, he mentions Bishop Hobart, and, by implication, the many more whose names and character are identified with his, and aims a blow in particular at the reputation and usefulness of "the Editor of the New York Churchman,"* duty to others and a proper regard for our own character, compel us to place him in such an "attitude" that he may indulge his own spleen without injury to his neighbors.

This "humble individual" affirms that one of the chief "obstacles to the growth and prosperity of the Church" is found in the "exclusive principles" maintained by a portion of her clergy. He names Bishop Hobart as the representative of a class, and the Editor of the New York Churchman as among the number of those who hold these "exclusive principles," and thus seeks to cover *them* with the odium in which he arrays their *principles*: at the same time declaring, in the true spirit of his *clique*, "I have not the least desire to cast personal odium upon any human being!" Now, we ask, what are these "exclusive principles," by adhesion to which a portion of our clergy are charged with the awful guilt of impeding the growth and prosperity of their Church? What *are* they? A writer of *intelligence*, in preferring such an accusation would, out of regard to his own credit, have stated them distinctly: a writer of *fairness*, in justice to those whose character he impeached, would have stated them distinctly: a writer of *piety*, from a sense of duty to his Maker, would have stated them distinctly. In vain, however, in the present case, shall we search for any such proof of intelligence, fairness, or piety, as a distinct specification of the "exclusive principles" which are made to involve us in guilt and expose us to obloquy. The writer in the Recorder evinces a total want of that mental discipline which enables a man to assume distinct positions, and fortify them with logical proof. His writing is in effect mere *extempore preaching*, and that of the low order, which mistakes boldness for force, substitutes vociferation for sense, and measures ability by lengthiness. In proof of this it is only necessary to say, that in the two essays before us, comprising together about three columns of matter, in which the charge of "exclusive principles" is rung through all its changes, the only attempt at a formal specification of these "exclusive principles" is contained in the following sentence, which, after some search, we found embedded in its mound of verbiage. Having assumed, and in our judgment *correctly* assumed, that the Church imposes simply the fact of the apostolical institution of episcopacy, thus leaving a wide range to private opinion, this writer proceeds:—

"But far beyond the ground which the authority of the Church directs us to occupy, many of our number are disposed to engraft upon this doctrine most offensive and useless inferences; they take it upon themselves to deny the authority of all ministrations which are not episcopal; to refuse the acknowledgment of the very existence, as a Christian Church, of a religious body which has not an episcopal ministry; to assert the guilt of voluntary separation and schism from the Christian Church upon those who remain in such a body; and to maintain the necessary impropriety, if not absolute sin, in any such intercourse of Episcopalians with such persons, as can be construed into an acknowledgment of the claims to be true members of the Christian Church which they are disposed to make."

And afterward, in his hortatory style, he says—

"Let us go out and announce to Christians around us, as the unquestionable truth, and as the certain doctrine of our Church,—that they are without a Christian ministry; without Christian sacraments; that they have no hope but in the uncovenanted mercies of God: (which, because there is no promise of salvation but in God's covenant in his Son, is no hope at all,) that they are in a state of schism, and therefore in a state of sin; that ours is God's only Church; and if they would be safe, they must abandon their errors and come into it: and what would be the universal effect, but hostility, if we were powerful, and ridicule, if we were weak?"

And this is all the statement which we can discover of the "exclusive principles" which are alleged to involve us in guilt and odium.

Now we deny every one of the above items: some of them are untrue literally and in every sense; all of them are untrue in the odious sense which from their connexion they are made to bear; and one of them contains no less than three separate misstatements. We are sorry to use such harsh language, but necessity is laid upon us; for when accusations are brought against the best friends and highest ornaments of our Church,—to say nothing of ourselves—what else can we do than either admit their truth or assert them to be untrue?

1. It is untrue that we, (and in this term we beg permission to include Bishop Hobart and his friends,) have engrafted on the doctrine of the Church any "offensive and useless inferences." The principles said to be exclusive are not "inferences" from the fact of the apostolical institution of episcopacy: they are distinct elementary truths revealed in the word of God, professed by the primitive fathers, and recognised and preserved in the Church of England and her daughter of America. Before "S. H. T" again pronounces these principles "offensive" and "useless," it may be well for him to remember that he enjoys this opinion in common with "all Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics." Shall he also have the benefit of the Collect for Good Friday?

2. It is not true, in any offensive sense, that we deny the authority of non-episcopal ministrations. On the contrary, we freely concede to them all the authority which their advocates claim for them. Most Nonepiscopalians claim no other authority for their ministrations than that which arises from the piety and ability of their ministers, their inward call to their office, their recognition by their congregations, and the seals of their ministry in the conversion of souls. All this authority we freely grant. Others claim in addition to this an authority derived from Christ, through the order of presbyters: this, too, whatever it is, we all freely grant, except perhaps a few who have been at the pains to prove the lay ordination of John Calvin. Now if, in addition to this, we think that a higher authority than this exists in things sacred, and that *that* authority is derived from Christ through the order of bishops, why should this opinion expose us to odium? We concede to our brethren of other denominations all that they claim for themselves: what more in reason can they ask?

3. It is untrue, in every offensive sense that "we refuse to acknowledge as a Christian Church, a religious body which has not an Episcopal ministry." On the contrary, we freely acknowledge every religious body to be a Christian Church, *on its own hypothesis* of a Christian Church; that is to say, we believe them to possess all which they think essential to the being of a Christian Church. What more can they in justice desire?

But do we believe such religious bodies to be Christian Churches on *our hypothesis* of the Christian Church? In other words, do we allow them to possess a something which they neither claim nor desire? This is more than can in reason be asked, but not more than we are free to yield. We believe that they have a valid baptism and the Scriptures of truth, and as these are of the essence of the Christian Church, we believe all religious bodies who possess them are *in so far* Christian Churches. But as we believe the essence of the Christian Church to comprehend more than this, it follows of course, that we regard them as Churches defective and imperfectly constituted.

4. It is untrue totally and in every sense, that we assert the guilt of voluntary separation and schism upon those who remain in religious bodies which have not Episcopal ministrations. We do not charge them with "separation;" it was their fathers who separated and not they. We do not charge them with a *voluntary* state of schism: we believe the evil on their part to be "involuntary," and we give them credit for being willing to be in a state of unity, and only regret that their judgment does not enable them to discover the means of carrying their good will into effect. We do not charge them with the *guilt* of schism: *that* rests on those who first made the schism; and as we do not believe in imputed sin, nor the "federal headship" of John Calvin or of John Wesley, any more than of Adam, so neither do we charge our brethren of other denominations with the guilt of a schism which their forefathers made. Thus the writer in the Recorder makes three misstatements, and after all misses the truth, which he probably had in his mind, but which either the dulness of his intellect rendered him unable to enunciate, or the wickedness of his heart induced him unconsciously to bury in a cloud of obloquy. What is that truth? Simply that we believe such religious bodies to be in a state of schism. Is there any thing odious in this? We think not. That we are separated from other religious bodies, not, we trust, in faith, nor in Christian spirit, but in ecclesiastical order, which is all the separation that we understand the word schism to imply, is a simple matter of fact. "S. H. T." himself, if he be a clergyman, cannot ask a nonepiscopally-ordained clergyman to administer the Lord's supper to his people. The fact of a schism then between such religious bodies and us, is undoubted; and the only question is whether we are to charge it upon them or ourselves. *We* think it is chargeable on them: and if the writer in the Recorder thinks differently, it is his duty to join them, or at least to leave us.

5. It is also utterly untrue that we "maintain the necessary impropriety, if not absolute sin, in any such intercourse of Episcopalians with such persons as can be construed into an acknowledgment of their claims to be true members of the Christian Church." On the contrary, we recognise such persons as true members of the Christian Church, and esteem it both a propriety and a duty which we delight to exercise, to welcome them to a participation in all the privileges to which Church membership entitles them, and especially to that of the Lord's supper.

So much for the first extract, and now for the more declamatory one: in which is implied that we believe other religious bodies to be, 1, "without a Christian ministry;" 2, "without Christian sacraments;" 3, "to have no hope but in the uncovenanted mercies of God," and indeed "no hope at all;" 4, "to be in a state of schism, and therefore in a state of sin;" 5, "that ours is God's only Church;" and 6, "that if others would be safe they must come into it." All these statements are untrue in like manner with the last.

1. It is untrue that we believe other religious bodies to be "without a Christian ministry." That they have a ministry is a palpable matter of fact: that their ministry is either Mahometan, Jewish, Infidel, or Pagan, nobody ever dreamed of asserting; that it is Christian and eminently productive of the faith and fruits of the Gospel we cheerfully allow. What "S. H. T." has *said* therefore, is untrue, for we grant that other religious bodies have a Christian ministry; what he *meant* to say, we have neither time nor patience to enquire. Probably he does not know himself.

2. It is untrue, in any offensive sense that we believe other religious bodies to be "without Christian sacraments." We have a better opinion of one of their sacraments than they have themselves, and as good an opinion of the other. Most of them regard baptism simply as a solemn dedication to the service of God: we regard baptism, even as they administer it, to be this, and to be furthermore, an initiation of the adult or infant baptized, into the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ: or in other words, to be productive of regeneration. They regard the Lord's supper simply as a commemorative and symbolical institution, blessed by the Holy Spirit as a means of quickening the faith of the recipients, and producing holy tempers and graces in their souls; and all this we readily grant. Thus we attach much greater efficacy to one of their sacraments than they do themselves, and quite as much to the other. But if in addition to this, we attach to the eucharist as instituted by Christ and by us administered a much higher import and authority, why should we be therefore reproached as 'exclusive?'"

3. It is untrue, that we believe they have no hope but in the uncovenanted mercies of God. We know that they have a hope in his covenanted mercies, and enjoy the richness of its consolation. They believe (those, that is, who believe in any condition) that the sole condition of this covenant, on the part of man, is faith: we allow their faith, and therefore grant, not only that they have a hope, but that, on their own hypothesis of the covenant, their hope is well grounded. Nay, more, granting, as we do, the validity of their baptism, we believe they may, if they choose, rest their hope in the covenanted mercies of God, even on our own hypothesis of the covenant.

4. It is untrue that we believe such religious bodies to be in a state of sin, in consequence of their being in a state of schism. The schism only becomes sinful when they are convinced of its reality, and wilfully refuse to repair it.

5. It is untrue that we believe "*ours* to be God's only Church." We believe, in the words of the Nicene Creed, in "one catholic and apostolic Church;" but we believe other religious bodies to be in such a sense branches of this Church as to secure the means of personal and everlasting salvation to all their members. Therefore;

6. It is untrue that we believe that if others "would be safe, they must abandon their errors, and come into *our* Church."

Thus, the principles imputed to us by the writer in the Recorder we utterly repudiate. But we have no wish to disguise our principles, and, therefore, we will state them as briefly as possible.

We do believe in "one catholic and apostolic Church;" we believe that in this Church Jesus Christ has deposited his word, and sacraments, and AUTHORITY to preach the word, and administer the sacraments. We believe that this authority is vested in, and transmitted through the order of bishops, and that it is necessary to impart *full efficacy and perpetuity* to the ministration of the word and sacraments. We are, therefore, dissatisfied with the Congregational authority, which is grounded simply on *natural* right, and Methodist and Presbyterian authority, which is grounded on presbyterial ordination. We do not deny an efficacy to these ministrations—such an efficacy as, under the blessing of the Holy Spirit, is adequate to the renovation and sanctification of the souls of those who use them: we only deny them that additional and distinctive efficacy—whatever it may be—which flows from a full adherence to the institutions of Christ in the purity of their original appointment, and which, we believe, will be seen necessary, if not now, at least in a future generation, to ensure their *perpetuity*, as well as to preserve their *integrity*.

Now as to the "exclusiveness" of these principles when fairly represented, we are willing to leave others to judge: but as we reject "S. H. T." as their expounder, so do we equally reject him as their historian. Here according to him is their history:

"For the first twenty-five years of our history after the Revolution, but very little will be found, as far as I have been able to gain information, of the pressing of these views upon the members of our Church. The moderation upon this subject of the venerable men who were highest in office and influence during that period, is well known. God grant that it may not die with them! They arrayed no hostility against themselves; they were approved and esteemed of all, as guides and examples, in things that were 'more excellent' than the collisions of party warfare. But after that period, these exclusive doctrines soon started into growth. For a time they gained ground, and were urged so earnestly by some, whose influence was great, that they were adopted far more extensively than could have been expected. But their growth and their power were chiefly identified with the influence of a single individual. His talents, his zeal, his command of pecuniary means, carried them forward during his life with remarkable energy."

To the splendid abilities of Bishop Hobart, in extending the belief and influence of these views, we bear our humble but most cheerful testimony. But who else than a mushroom Episcopalian would ever pretend to give such a date of their origin, or think to identify their growth and power with the influence of Bishop Hobart? *We* can tell "S. H. T." that before he drew a drop of nourishment—if nourishment he has ever drawn—from the mother whom he now disgraces, these views *were* held, and, by means of just such distortions and perversions as he now disgorges, exposed their advocates to a scorn, hatred, persecution, and obloquy, compared to which the trials of Bishop Hobart, severe as they were, were as sunshine. Does he not know that Bishop Seabury, (we trust we may be pardoned the allusion,) during the twelve years of his episcopate, was a living martyr to the principles which he is pleased to denominate "exclusive?" Does he not know, that for the advocacy of these very principles, he was exposed to insult on public occasions, that the public prints of New England, teemed with invective against him, and that all the varieties of abuse, from the refined sarcasm of the author of Mac Fingal, down to the rancorous bigotry of the prototypes of "S. H. T." himself, were put in requisition to overwhelm him with the odium of these "exclusive principles?" Does he not know that Bishop Jarvis followed in the uncompromising exhibition of the same principles? Does he not know that Bishop Benjamin More was engaged in a public controversy with Dr. Lynn of this city in the maintenance of the same principles? He probably does not know this, but before he speaks again of the *origin* of "exclusive principles," we advise him to ask information of those who have been long enough in the Church to know something of her history.

We take "S. H. T." to be what is called a Low Churchman, a term which has long been, and we trust will long continue to be, disused as a distinction of party. In the present state of the Church, it is of no other use than that assigned to it by the author of the "High Churchman Vindicated" to denote a loose and feeble attachment for the peculiarities of the Church. It cannot be denied, nor, considering our position and history, is it strange, that there exist within our pale many and extensive sympathies and affinities for other religious bodies around us, which are strangers to our distinctive views. To collect these floating and fugitive elements, to embody them in a definite form, and thus to make them a badge and rallying ground of party, may not require a worse heart than is manifested (we trust not possessed) by the writer in the Episcopal Recorder, but it does require a clearer and better furnished head. If there be such persons as "Exclusives" in the Church, it is abundantly evident that "S. H. T." knows neither where to find them nor how to hit them; for like the Cyclops after the sad prank played on him by Ulysses, he deals his blows with a blind rage and impotent ferocity. We advise him, therefore, to give over the attempt, and instead of trying, through the press, to revive and ferment prejudices against his Church on the ground of alleged "exclusiveness," to confine his labors to his pulpit and his parish, and thus save his Church from the mischiefs, if not his own soul from the guilt, of spiritual treason and parricide.

INTELLIGENCE.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR CONFIRMATION IN NEW YORK AND BROOKLYN.

Septuagesima Sunday, January 22, St. Thomas' Church.

Second Sunday in Lent, February 19, Church of the Ascension.

Fifth Sunday in Lent, March 12, St. Clement's Church.

Sunday next before Easter, March 19, French Church, Du St. Esprit.

First Sunday after Easter, April 2, St. Peter's Church, A. M., Zion Church, P. M.

Second Sunday after Easter, April 9, St. Luke's Church.

Third Sunday after Easter, April 16, Mission Church of the Holy Evangelists.

Fourth Sunday after Easter, April 23, Mission Church of the Epiphany.

Fifth Sunday after Easter, April 30, Trinity Church, *Brooklyn*.

Episcopal Acts by the Bishop of this Diocese.—Thursday, December 29, consecrated St. Paul's Church, Flatbush, King's county. The instrument of donation was presented, in behalf of the Vestry, by Matthew Clarkson, Esq., senior warden, and read by the Rev. Thomas S. Brittan, the rector, and the sentence of consecration was read by the Rev. John F. Messenger, the assistant minister of the church, and the morning prayer by the Rev Benjamin Cutler, D D, rector of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, assisted by the Rev. Charles V. Kelly, rector of St Bartholomew's Church, New York, who read the lessons; and the sermon preached by the Bishop.

Festival of the Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ, Sunday, January 1, consecrated Calvary Church in this city. The instrument of donation was presented, in behalf of the Vestry, by James D Fitch, M. D, senior warden, and read by the Rev. Francis H. Cuming, the rector of the church. The sentence of consecration was read by the Rev. Benjamin Dorr, Secretary and General Agent of the Domestic Committee of the Board of Missions, and the morning prayer by the Rev. William Morris, principal of a collegiate school in this city, and officiating at Williamsburgh, King's county; and the sermon preached by the Bishop.

The following extract from Bishop Onderdonk's sermon preached at the consecration of Calvary Church, in this city, is published by request.

"My brethren, the rector, lay officers, and people of this parish: most sincerely do I congratulate you on the joyful event of this day, and pray that it may be richly blessed to you. And I pray also that your hearts may be cheered, and your hands strengthened, in this godly enterprise, by the practical efficient sympathy of your brethren. It is little creditable to the Christianity of this growing city, and certainly little to the large portion of its wealth which has been entrusted to the members of our communion, that the accumulated ills of infidelity and irreligion should be suffered to increase in a degree so far beyond that of the means of moral and spiritual amelioration. You have chosen a good stand for erecting the banner of the Gospel. Do you your duty in sustaining it; and trust that God will not allow so excellent an undertaking to want good and efficient friends."

In giving the above extract to the public, I beg leave to present also a few additional remarks.

B. T. O.

Calvary Church is situated on Fourth Avenue, the line of the Harlæm railroad, near Thirtieth-street, about two miles and a half from the City Hall, and at a great distance from any house of public worship. The population around it is rapidly increasing, and was giving most serious manifestations of the want of the wholesome moral influence of the services, ordinances, and instructions of the Gospel. In view of this, a few pious and enterprising individuals, principally young men, determined on an effort to rear a temple and an altar where the blessings of those services, ordinances, and instructions might be diffused around. The corporation of Calvary Church was formed, and this edifice erected. It is, indeed, a little one, and a humble; but, like "a little one" of old, it may prove a rest and a refuge to many who are in danger of perishing. Such may "escape thither, and" their "soul shall live." (Gen. xix. 20) It is true, a more generous support, by the community, of this undertaking, or its being combined with magnificent schemes for the improvement of property might have secured the consecration, in due time, of a larger and more splendid edifice, and one which, to human view, might have been more worthy of the solemnities of consecration; but those solemnities were a holy dedication to ONE who looketh beyond the exterior. They were an offering to which may be applied the gracious sentiment of the Saviour, when he conferred on the poor widow that expression of divine approbation and acceptance, *She hath done what she could.* While time was passing in discussing the expediency of erecting a large and handsome church, and casting about for the ways and means, and ascertaining how and where it could best answer worldly views, the opportunity of doing the great good now imperiously called for, in this section of the city, might have been lost. Our brethren of Calvary Church, therefore, acted wisely. They did what they could. They seized the present moment, and erected a neat and commodious temple, of dimensions proportioned to the probable means before them. The zeal, devotion, and disinterestedness which they thus manifested gave to that temple, I doubt not, a merciful acceptance, at its dedication to God, nought diminished by its want of outward magnificence.

I have felt it my duty to say thus much, because I had heard of this enterprise having been slightly spoken of. This was undeserved. A place of worship here was greatly needed. Present and prospective means would not admit of one more costly; and I am happy thus to express my entire conviction of the propriety of the Vestry's doing as they did; and my sincere hope, that what is still wanting to defray the expense of the undertaking will be promptly supplied; and the little body of Christians there to be fathered, and nurtured, and enlarged, be duly aided in sustaining the ministrations of the sanctuary.

Clerical Change.—The Rev. Henry Anthon having been elected to the rectorship of St. Mark's Church, in this city, has accepted the office, and resigned his station as an assistant minister of Trinity Church.

On Wednesday, the 19th of October, the Right Reverend Dr. Monk, Bishop of the united See of Gloucester and Bristol, arrived in Bristol about three o'clock, and was met at the chapter-room of the cathedral by the Mayor, in his official costume, accompanied by the Reverends Lord W. Somerset, Dr. Lee, Prebendary Harvey, the minor canons, his lordship's chaplain, and upward of seventy of the clergy of the city and neighborhood. After attending divine service, his lordship proceeded to the chapter-room, where he was presented with an address, by Mr. Prebendary Harvey, on behalf of the clergy, couched in terms of affectionate regard and personal respect toward his lordship, but regretting that the ecclesiastical commissioners had thought it necessary to deprive Bristol of its separate bishopric. His lordship returned a suitable and affectionate reply. The clergy present were then individually introduced to him; after which his lordship withdrew.—*Bristol Gazette.*

Education in Liverpool.—In this town 12,000 children receive a poor education at the cost of their parents; 13,000 are assisted by private charity in attaining the rudiments of education; 3,700 are taught at Sunday schools; 4,000 of the upper classes attend the superior schools: 32,700 children, therefore, are more or less educated, while there remain 30,000, between five and fifteen years of age, who receive no education at all.—*Atlas.*

NOTICE.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE.

The winter term of this institution commences on Thursday, the 5th of January, 1837. Candidates for admission will apply to the President or any of the Faculty, either during vacation, or at the commencement of the term.

Hartford, Conn., December 23, 1836.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.

The subscriber, as Treasurer of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union gratefully acknowledges the receipt of a donation of $4 51 from the Sunday school of St. Bartholomew's Church, New York; also $20 00 from the Association of Trinity Parish, Southwark, Philadelphia, by the hands of the rector, the Rev. John Coleman.

John W. Mitchell, *Treasurer*,
Jan. 4, 1837. 28 Ann-street.

THIRD MISSION STATION.

The subscriber, as city missionary very thankfully acknowledges the following receipts for the poor of his station:—

From a friend, $15 75—Thomas Otis, Esq., 10 00—C. J. Aldis, Esq., 10 00—Oblations for the poor, from the congregation in Hammond street, 5 00—Do. from Varick street, 1 21—A bundle of clothing from the Fifteenth Ward Sewing Circle—A piece of calico and a bundle of clothing from a friend—From a lady a piece of cotton shirting.

E. B. Kellogg, Missionary,
New York, Jan. 4, 1837. 401 Hudson-street.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Since the last public acknowledgment, the Committee have received:—

From a Parishioner of Trinity Church, Geneva, N. Y., for general purposes, $5 00—Miss J. E. P., Fredonia, N. Y., for the Mission to Crete, 1 00—Joseph Lovell, Esq., of New-Orleans, through C. P. Leverich, Esq., being an appropriation of $ 00 to the cause of Foreign Missions, made by him on Good Friday last, with interest thereon, 209 00—An anonymous benefactor, being the amount of his pledge for 1837, through the hands of the Rev. Secretary and General Agent, an annual subscription, 50.

Total, $265 00.
Jan. 4, 1837. Henry Cary, *Treasurer.*

PRESS DEPOSITORY,

28 *Ann-street.*

Letters have been received at the N. Y. Prot. Episcopal Press, during the week ending January 5th, from the following persons, viz.

Postmaster, Enfield, Massachusetts—Rev. J. W. Diller—Mr. John Treadwell—N. H. Stratford—David Bixby.

Received by the Gen. Prot. Episc. S. S. Union.

Miss Anna B. Shaw—Thomas Latimer—Rev. William L. Johnson—Miss Betsey M. Bostwick—Rev. John Coleman, *with remit.*

BOTANY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

This new and valuable work by the authoress of the Wonders of the Deep, is published this day by the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union, and may be had at the Depository, No. 28 Ann-street.

---

* "No attentive reader of the New York Churchman, even for the year past, I should suppose, can have failed to see the eagerness with which these exclusive principles and excessive claims have been urged, not only in the editorial department of that paper, but also in some of the important communications which are introduced through it to the notice of Episcopalians. The exceedingly uncharitable feeling and unyielding purpose which that paper often displays, in pressing upon others the hostile inferences which are drawn from these principles—when the position and authority of that paper are considered, and its Editor is known as a teacher in the largest of our theological schools of our future ministers at the altar, become a most important sign in the prospects of the Church; and would be a cause for unmingled apprehension, but for evidences which are now so happily coming out, that they do not meet the general approbation of Episcopalians. When I see these exclusive principles thus insisted upon, and know that several other of our periodicals have assumed the same ground, and mark the increasing concentration with which they have been urged in many late episcopal addresses, even in some quarters where I should have least expected it, I confess my heart trembles for the ark of God, and I cannot but stop to contemplate the probable result of the prevalence of such offensive doctrines throughout any large portion of the Episcopal Church."—*Episcopal Recorder, Dec. 31.*

From the (London) Christian Observer.

The Grave.

Thou art a mournful thing,
O grave! thy shadow over all is thrown.
Man builds bright bowers in life's delightful spring,
But thou canst throw them down.

The child in infancy—
Ere the heart knows to grieve, the eye to weep—
On thy low bosom resting peacefully,
Slumbers a calm still sleep.

The happy dreams of youth;
The heart's warm impulses; the fresh, the free,
The bosom's joy, and the clear tones of truth,
All perish deep in thee.

And he in manhood's prime—
Skill'd in the arts of gain, or learning's lore—
To thee, 'mid all the freshness of his time,
Goes, and returns no more.

The old gray headed sire,
Bowed with the weight of feebleness and woes,
Longs to behold life's flick'ring lamp expire,
And hails thy deep repose.

The matron and the maid,
Woman's deep feeling—woman's fervent love—
Each throbbing heart, in clay cold stillness laid,
To thy dark realms remove.

The mourner weeps no more—
The sorrows of his aching bosom cease,
When his toss'd bark within thy friendly shore
Is safely moor'd in peace.

The evil and the good
Alike lie hid beneath thy sombre shade:
The rich man, and the bare of daily food,
By thee are equal made.

There ne'er hath pass'd an hour,
Since earth was peopled with her numerous race,
In which her children have not felt thy power,
Thou gloomy dwelling-place!

Such is our mortal life!
All that have been, are now, and still may be,
Must drop the burthen of their human strife,
And find their end in thee;

Yet, on time's fleeting wings
A day shall come, whose penetrating light
Shall bare the deepest of thy hidden things
To universal sight.

And—thanks to golden faith!—
There is a land, far hence, amid the sky,
Where a Deliverer has conquer'd death,
Where death and thou shalt die.

'T is here that we would go.
Oh! is it not a glory-beaming shore;
Where flowers unsullied by earth's breathings blow,
And graves are dark no more!

From the Christian Witness.

EPISCOPALIANS AND METHODISTS.

We find the following remarks under the above title in the Zion's Herald of last week:—

"There appears to be a strong desire on the part of the Established Church in Great Britain, that the Methodists, as they say, 'should return' to them. Something of this kind begins to develope itself in the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, in relation to American Methodists. In fact, it is the subject of considerable conversation, both among the laity and clergy of that denomination. We do not intend to express any opinion whether the Methodist Church in this country will ever join the Protestant Episcopal Church, or whether the latter will join the former—but we wish simply to inquire in what this desire of union originates? It is a subject worth looking into. Is it because that denomination, small in numerical strength compared with some others, is desirous of swelling its numbers for the purpose of extending its influence? Is it because many of her most useful, and some of her most eminent ministers, were once Methodist preachers, and, therefore, if the whole were to unite with them, a great accession would be made to their ministerial talent and usefulness? Or does it originate in a heartfelt desire for Christian fellowship, and such an estimation of our piety and usefulness as would induce them to receive us on terms of equality? If the latter, may it not be a question whether we shall join *them*, or they *us*? All the above-named motives are good, and we do not say what we have, because we suspect any thing improper of them, for we always have had, and still do have, too high an opinion of them for this. But as the desire seems to be principally, or wholly on their side, we have no doubt, that whenever the Protestant Episcopal Church applies to the Methodist Episcopal Church for the terms upon which they may be admitted among us, their application will be courteously received, and a respectful reply given."

The history of Wesleyan Methodism is familiar to most of our readers. John and Charles Wesley were both presbyters of the Church of England. They were men of devoted piety, who lamented the coldness which pervaded the Establishment during their time, (about the middle of the last century.) and the inadequacy of its arrangements for the private religious instruction of the people. They adopted measures for securing lay assistants, who should go about the country, exhort the people from house to house, (*never in Church hours*,) and pursue such other measures as in his [John Wesley's] judgment it was proper for laymen to pursue in advancing the spiritual interests of the people. In this he was joined by several devoted men, clergymen of the Church of England. The number of his lay agents at length became so great, that he was forced to institute an annual conference for the regulation of the itineracy. The thing had in this stage evidently grown beyond his expectations, (probably beyond his wishes.) He still, however, required that there should be no preaching in his chapel in Church hours, and that his connexion should receive the sacraments only at the hands of regularly-ordained clergymen. From this requisition he never relaxed during his life. At the very next conference, which occurred after his death, however, his preachers provided conditions under which service might be held in their chapels during Church hours, and the sacraments administered by them. Since that time the Methodists have become a different sect in England, although they still retain the liturgy of the Church of England, and in some parts of the United Kingdom still adhere to the rules of Wesley, holding no religious meetings during the hours of public service, attending and receiving the sacraments in the Church, and in all respects adhering as regular members of her communion. It is not, therefore, in this day,—when the tone of piety in the Church of England is so elevated, that if Wesley had lived in its light, he would not have been, as he has, the unintentional father of a sect,—it is not strange nor arrogant in the members of the Church of England, clerical and lay, to speak of "*the return*" of the Methodists to her pale; since Wesley is almost canonized by his sect, and his sentiments on some subjects received as oracular; especially since the English Methodists belong to the conservative ranks, almost to a man.

But—"Something of this kind begins to develope itself in the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, in relation to American Methodists. In fact, it is the subject of considerable conversation, both among the clergy and laity of that denomination!" Indeed! and where does the worthy Editor witness these conversations which he feels himself called upon to herald? Though we frequently enjoy the privileges of listening to the conversation of our brethren, of all grades, both in the ministry and out of it, on the interests of our Church, and its relations to surrounding sects, no "considerable share of their conversation" has, in our presence, been devoted to "the subject." No sect appears to have less occasion to remain in a state of separation from us than the Episcopal Methodists. They maintain our doctrines, approve of the three orders of our ministry, and seem to differ from us in nothing essential, but in that their ministry is invalid.

One would have supposed, that in the frequent conversations that have taken place among Episcopalians, which have come to the knowledge of the Herald, and in which the "strong desire" for union was betrayed, some of the *reasons* which have led us to entertain the desire would also have transpired. It seems not, however, for the Editor appears at a loss to decide what they can possibly be. We do not wonder at his perplexity. He, of course, knows precisely how desirable an accession the whole Methodist connexion would prove to an ecclesiastical establishment like ours, and if he cannot fix upon any reason which would satisfactorily account for our deserving such a result, we are not prepared at present to relieve him of his difficulty. This much, however, we will venture to say,—one, at least, of his contingent reasons is not the true one. Our "strong desire" does not grow out of a conviction that if the whole were to unite with [us] "a great accession would be made to [our] ministerial talent" ——. If "many of [our] most useful, and some of [our] most eminent ministers" were once Methodist preachers, it is perhaps fair to infer that the subject of a union with our Church has, sometimes, at least, occurred to some of their members. If it be, as the Editor asserts, that the "desire" is principally, or wholly on [our] side, we are constrained to remember that it was not always so; and in calling the Editor to refresh his memory a little in this particular, we shall take occasion to show him that the *development* of this desire for union began at a time somewhat anterior to that of which he speaks, and in an altogether different quarter. Dr. Coke, our readers are aware, was commissioned by Wesley to exercise episcopal powers in this country. This was a stroke of policy, on the part of Wesley, so well adapted to extend the power of his connexion in America, that we cannot agree with his brother Charles in the belief that he knew not what he was about. Being very much advanced in age when he thus usurped the episcopal prerogative, his brother regards it as a lamentable proof that John is in his dotage, and regrets that having felt justified in sustaining and co-operating with him in his whole previous course, he is now compelled to express his entire disapproval of this measure, and to separate himself from the whole transaction. Episcopalians in the colonies, and especially in Virginia, felt greatly their deprivation of not being where they could receive the apostolic rite of confirmation. There were no bishops of the Establishment in this country. All our young men were compelled to go to England if they would obtain orders. The few churches, poorly supplied with ministers, irresponsible to any ecclesiastical head, were languishing in all their interests. At this juncture Dr. Coke was sent out by Mr. Wesley, instructed to exercise the very powers with which the people, especially of the Establishment, were longing to see some one invested. Methodism, as a system, was then unknown: it had not attained its maturity. The Wesleys, and Dr. Coke himself, were known to be ministers of the Church of England, and professedly much devoted to her interests. Was not the event fairly to be counted upon, that multitudes would go over to the Methodists, hardly conscious at the time that they were leaving the Church which had been the friend of their youth? Such was the result, and the Methodists, if we are not misinformed, maintain in Virginia the supremacy they acquired to this day. Yet this same Dr. Coke, (a most worthy and respectable man,) was not, it would seem, without his compunctious visitings for that he had so fairly separated himself from the Church of England, as to have assumed one of her offices to which he had never been duly ordained. Did you ever, Mr. Editor, read that letter of his to Bishop White, from which the following extracts are made?

"Right Rev. Sir.—Permit me to intrude a little on your time upon a subject of great importance.

"You, I believe, are conscious that I was brought up in the Church of England, and have been ordained a presbyter of that Church. For many years I was prejudiced, even I think to bigotry, in favor of it; but through a variety of causes or incidents, to mention which would be tedious and useless, my mind was exceedingly biased on the other side of the question. In consequence of this, I am not sure but I went farther in the separation of our Church in America than Mr. Wesley, from whom I had received my commission, did intend. He did indeed solemnly invest me, as far as he had right so to do, with episcopal authority, but did not intend, I think, that an entire separation should take place He, being pressed by our friends on this side of the water for ministers to administer sacraments to them, (there being very few clergy of the Church of England then in the States,) went farther, I am sure, than he would have gone, if he had foreseen some events which followed. And this I am certain of—that he is now sorry for the separation.

"But what can be done for a reunion, which I much wish for; and to accomplish which Mr. Wesley, I have no doubt, would use his influence to the utmost? The affection of a very considerable number of the preachers, and most of the people, is very strong toward him, notwithstanding the excessive ill usage he received from a few. My interest also is not small; and both his and mine would readily, and to the utmost, be used to accomplish that (to us) very desirable object; if a readiness were shown by the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church to reunite."

After some statistical statements calculated to show that the Methodists would be a very considerable numerical addition to our ranks, and alluding to some of the objections which he feared might accrue to thwart his wishes, Dr. Coke adds,—

"My desire of a reunion is so sincere and earnest, that these difficulties almost make me tremble: and yet something must be done before the death of Mr. Wesley, otherwise I shall despair of success: for though my influence among the Methodists in these States, as well as in Europe, is, I doubt not, increasing, yet Mr. Asbury, whose influence is very capital, will not easily comply; nay, I know he will be exceedingly averse to it.

"In Europe, where some steps had been taken tending to a separation, all is at an end. Mr. Wesley is a determined enemy of it, and I have lately borne an open and successful testimony against it.

"Shall I be favored with a private interview with you in Philadelphia?

"In the mean time permit me, with great respect, to subscribe myself,

"Right Rev. Sir,
"Your very humble servant in Christ,
"Thomas Coke.

"*Richmond, April 24*, 1791.
"The Rt. Rev. Father in God, Bishop White."

We leave this branch of the subject without further comment.

What, after all, is the design of these remarks of the Herald, but to bring into disrepute the scheme of Christian union? We cannot describe the painful emotions which affect us, when we peruse these insidious gibes upon a subject as holy as any which our Saviour has commended to our attention and regard. We confess that our confidence in the present feasibility of the scheme is daily suffering abatement, meeting, as we do, with frequent, though indirect expressions of decided opposition to its success. If religious journals are any index to the feelings of the respective denominations to which they belong, we know of at least one sect which is "utterly purposed, throughout its whole membership, to say, in action, if not in word, to every other branch of the Christian family, 'Come not near, for I am holier than thou.'"

When editors tell us that the plan is chimerical,—when they accuse Episcopalians (because their bishops, and some of their journals have spoken in its favor,) of desiring to merge all other denominations in their own, we cannot fail to infer their personal disinclination to unite with others on any terms of compromise whatever. When jealousy is so much more active than Christian charity, little is to be hoped until the Spirit of God shall have reformed the temper and disposition of the soul.

From the (Utica) Gospel Messenger.

THE MINISTRY OF CHRIST.

The Ministerial Character of Christ practically considered. By Charles R. Sumner, D. D., *Bishop of Winchester*. A new edition, revised and enlarged. London. 1835.

III. The ministers of Christ are continually taught to feel their infirmities. While they speak of the wisdom of God, they are compelled to mourn over their own ignorance. While they declare the power of God, they are themselves bowed down with weakness. Exposed, like their brethren, to all the temptations, snares, and trials of this life, they have too often to lament how greatly they are themselves influenced by those things against which they warn their people. Christ alone possessing the fulness of original and inherent powers, united in himself all diversities of gifts, and combined all excellences in a character of faultless perfection. He enjoyed unlimited grace and wisdom. He exercised unlimited power. He imparts from his fulness grace, wisdom, and power to all who follow him in faith and meekness; advancing them to higher and still higher degrees of divine power without other limitation than man's capacity for its reception. And as the power of God and the wisdom of God were in him when he taught, he spoke with authority; as a sovereign, whose word none could dispute, and whose law must be reverenced and obeyed.

Yet, from the height of this pre-eminence, he deigns to give to Christian ministers, in all succeeding ages, an example of that spirit of prayer in which all their labors for the cure of souls, if they would expect success, must be conducted. Prayer was the habitual language of our Lord. Nothing of importance was done by him without it. Prayer, marked with intense earnestness, it might be almost said with importunity, as if he would give an illustration of the moral of his own parable—that men ought always to pray, and not to faint. If such, then, was his conduct, who, in the power and nature of the Godhead, was one with the Father, still more needful is it that on the ministers and stewards of Christ's mysteries the praying spirit of their Master should rest. They must wrestle earnestly for the desired grace; not putting up faint and languid prayers, but lifting up holy hands, without doubting, like those who really believe that the promise will be fulfilled: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." Receiving from his fulness, it is their encouragement and comfort to know that he can impart life and spirit, unction and power, to their ministrations; speaking to the heart what they speak to the ear, and breathing upon the dry bones to which they prophesy.

From the Penny Sunday Reader, an English work not republished in this country.

BAPTISM.

The congregation was dismissed, for the afternoon service was ended, and the parting blessing had been given; but there still remained two or three scattered groups. There were mothers who came to return thanks for their deliverance from their "great pain and peril." Little children brought to be washed in the water of baptism, and presented in faith and hope to their merciful Saviour. Grave fathers thinking, perhaps, of new exertions to be made in answer to the calls of an increased family; and young sponsors, serious, yet evidently pleased with their interesting office. I left my accustomed seat, and went, as I sometimes do on such occasions, into the gallery behind the font. I was alone. The christening parties went into the vestry, and I sat looking on the empty seats and the silent aisles, which, as the evening closed, became every moment more and more dim. The rising wind in the tossing chestnut branches was, for a short time, the only sound I heard; and then a light was placed on the communion table, and an orderly party knelt at the rails, and there arose a sweet clear voice of praise and thanksgiving. It ceased, and the train moved down toward the font. There was the priest, in his simple dress of "linen, clean and white." Long may such a dress be a meet emblem, that thy priests, my country's Church, are "clothed with righteousness!" And when he had taken his station at the font, the light which was needed, and yet which struggled imperfectly with the fading gleam of evening, shone on a varied and pleasing group. The elder women's scarlet cloaks formed a bright contrast to the long white robes in which the infants were arrayed; and the mothers, and the young female sponsors, wearing their best,—light cotton gowns, silk shawls, and new straw bonnets,—formed, for a poor country parish, a very gay assembly. Do not quarrel with my word,

"The innocent are gay,—the lark is gay."

I assure you, that as the service began, there was a silence which spoke of the mind's attention, and of the heart's prayer.

The priest took one fair child after another in his arms, "Received him into the congregation of Christ's flock, and did sign him with the sign of the cross;" and one mother after another stepped tremblingly forward, and took her own precious one, and folded it to her heart; feeling more than she had ever done before all the depth of a mother's love, and pouring on its young head all the fervency of a mother's blessing. There was a pause, and two or three persons dressed in shabby mourning, which had evidently been worn for many a relation and many an acquaintance before, brought to the font an infant, whose sickly form, and weak, moaning cry, told more than the narrow band of crape round its cap, or the rusty black shawl in which they had wrapped it, a tale of "father and mother's forsaking." It might be fancy, but I thought the tone of tenderness in which the minister had addressed each unconscious child, as it lay in his arms, was yet more tender when he looked on this one. The mothers, I thought, gazed with deeper love on their own happy children, as the cry of this little motherless one reached their ears. The fathers looked graver, and there were tears in the young women's eyes:

And well the gathering tears might start,
As they named the infant's name;
Whose mother had died of a broken heart,
From mourning its father's shame.

Poor little thing! it was come into a troublesome world, to be sure; it was tossing on rough waves; but the frail bark was soon to be in port, where no storms come. The woman whom the parish officers engaged to nurse the child proved extremely careless of it; and the next thing we heard, was, that in consequence of her neglect, it had met with a frightful accident; and the overseers removed it to another nurse. Having heard thus much, I could not of course be surprised, when passing one winter's day through the churchyard, I saw a little narrow grave dug in the part called the poor's ground; and heard, upon inquiry, that it was for Martha's child. It was buried that evening. No knell had tolled for it when it died; no mourner stood by the grave; the nurse brought the unornamented and nameless coffin under her cloak, and there was no pall to cover it. It was of little moment; the grass and the spring violets grow there, in token that being "sown in weakness, it shall be raised in power;" and the spirit so forsaken, so lonely on earth, found, doubtless, a bright and innumerable company to welcome it at the gates of heaven.

From the Protestant Episcopalian.

OUGHT CHRISTIANS TO JOIN THE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY?

Messrs. Editors,—The question which I propose to discuss, with permission, is not whether it is *expedient* or not for Christians to join temperance societies, but whether it is *right*. If it is not *right*, it cannot be *expedient*; neither can it be *expedient* to discuss the subject at this time or at any other. I hope it will be understood by all who will do me the favor to read these remarks, that the question is not, whether intemperance is a great evil, or whether it ought to be discountenanced and prevented by every proper means. Upon these points, I suppose that there is but one opinion among all good men. Let no one, then, impute to me any other fault (if it be a fault) than that I maintain that Christians ought not to connect themselves with temperance societies; *ought not*, because it is not *right*; and therefore *cannot*, without endangering the cause of Christianity itself.

My first reason for this opinion is:—*they already belong to a society which was instituted by the Lord* Jesus Christ *himself, for the suppression of every sin, and for the cultivation and promotion of every virtue*.

That you may see the full range of this consideration, it will be well to consider what is the precise nature of each of these societies.

By the Church I understand that society which was instituted by the Son of God, to be composed of all such as should become his followers, and submit themselves to him, as their *head* of *wisdom*, *influence*, and *authority*. Over this Church the Lord Jesus Christ presides. To it he has given his *word* for its direction; his *ministry* for its edification; his *covenant* as a bond of union to himself; his *sacraments* as the seals of the covenant; and his *promises* for the encouragement and incitement of his people to the end of the world.

To this Church, thus organized for efficient action, Jesus Christ has said: "Ye are the salt of the earth"—"Ye are the light of the world—a city set on a hill, which cannot be hid." On this Church rests the obligation, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Among other good works, the Lord has commanded his Church "to be temperate in all things." And among other ways, so in this also, to let their light shine, by precept and example, that their influence may be felt; and others seeing their good works, be thus led to glorify God.

Such is the Church, and such its relation to the temperance cause. Now, what is a temperance society? It is a society of recent origin, of human device, of voluntary association, having no respect to the opinions or practices of its members upon other subjects than temperance, without any recognition of Christ's authority, independent of the instructions of his word, nor recognising the ministry of reconciliation, having no regard to the Christian covenant, and placing no confidence in the promises of the Gospel, a society which is united together by no other tie but a common pledge to abstain from the use of intoxicating drinks, and to discourage, as much as possible, their use in others.

The question recurs—*Is it right for a Christian, who, by his own election, belongs to the former of these societies, to connect himself to the latter?*

No one will say that it will be right for him to separate himself from the Church in order to connect himself with a temperance society. If, then, he joins such a society, he will still continue his connexion with the Church and will belong to two societies, both having the same object in view.

Would this be right? Let it be remembered, that the two societies of which I am speaking are based upon entirely different principles of moral action; (I speak of the temperance societies as constituted upon paper, and not of the principles or motives of individuals.) Is it right for a Christian to belong to two societies thus organized? If he does, what *light* will he reflect upon the world? The light of the Church; i. e. of Christ its head, or the light of the temperance society? Which set of principles does he intend to recommend by his example? Those of the Church, or those of the temperance society?

But the Christian is not only bound to set a consistent example before men, but to employ his personal influence and exertion for the suppression of intemperance within his appropriate sphere. In doing so, he cannot act as an individual. He has parted with his individual character, and belongs to two societies, both having the same end in view. With which society shall the Christian act? with the Church, or with the temperance society? If with the temperance society, under the influence of which set of principles shall he act? those of the Church, or those of the temperance society? If those of the temperance society, does he not virtually abandon the Church, and say that he has found out a new and better way of doing good than that which Jesus Christ appointed, and does he not, by his conduct, recommend to the world the temperance pledge as a stronger motive to virtue, than the pledge of the Christian covenant? But perhaps it will be said, that when he acts with the temperance society, he acts under Christian principles, and thinks himself more than justified in that his aim is to exert an influence which he could not do as a Christian. Is this right? Is he not avowing one set of principles, and acting under another? Why is this? What necessity for this double-dealing, unless, indeed, the design is to avoid the reproach of the cross? Would it not be better, more honest, if it must be so, that the Christian needs go out of the Church to do good, that he should avow his principles whenever he acts, and recommend them to those with whom he associates?

Again, the Christian is required, whatever he does, "to do all to the glory of God." He must not lose sight of this motive in suppressing intemperance, any more than in doing good in another way. In acting to the glory of God, it is not only necessary that he keep his mind steadily under the guidance of this principle; but he is required so to put forth his exertions, "that God in all things may be glorified, through Jesus Christ." While the Christian moves in his proper sphere, and acts in union with the Church, the glory of all the good which he may accomplish will redound to God, through Christ. But if he is induced to fly off from his appointed orbit, and to associate with the temperance society, suppose that he does accomplish much good, the glory accrues to the temperance society, and not to God.

The Christian is also bound to regard the *will* of God, as expressed in holy Scripture, as the *only safe rule of moral obligation* for himself and for all men. If it be inquired of him why he is temperate himself, or why he is desirous to make others so, his appropriate answer to them that ask him is, because it is the order of God. The Church of the Lord Jesus Christ receives this rule of morals, and, as a member thereof, if any man speaks or acts, he speaks and acts "as the oracles of God." The temperance societies, as such, do not recognise this rule; individuals may, but the societies do not, except in a very few instances.

The Christian, furthermore, is taught to have no confidence in himself, or in his own virtuous resolutions; but that it is necessary for him, if he would break loose from any one of the snares of the devil, that he must rely for strength upon "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ." While he acts as a Christian, he avows this principle, if not in words, yet by the fact that he professes to be a Christian. The moment he leaves the Church, and connects himself with a temperance society, where man's *inability* is not acknowledged, nor the *fulness* of Jesus Christ asserted, he lends the weight of his influence to lead men into error.

Finally, not to be tedious in multiplying considerations tending to throw additional light upon the proposition which I have ventured to defend: it is the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, that his Church should be a society "at unity in itself." "For as the natural body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ," or the Church of Christ. I need hardly to remark, that the unity of the Church, in its action and influence upon the world, is destroyed, if her members go out from her sacred enclosure to unite with other societies, not known in the Gospel.

I submit these thoughts to the candid attention of your readers. They have decided my own judgment in the case, and I think them entitled to very serious consideration.

Yours respectfully,
G. B.

Bishop Doane's second charge, "The Church's Care for Little Children," ought to be reprinted in this country. It is a most pleasing and affectionate view of that important subject, *catechising*, and is full of the peculiar feeling and eloquence of its excellent author. A charge, too, from Bishop Ives has just been received, called "The Duties now especially called for, to preserve the faith of the Church," every word of which is full of precious and solid instruction for these times. It is a truly catholic charge, worthy, in principles, of a son-in-law of Bishop Hobart. Bishop Ives would wish for no higher human praise; and he may be well assured, (as indeed he is) that the writer does not feel that he could give higher. The American branch of our Church is rising every day in power, in importance, in interest. The members and ministers of it are doing all in their power to form a learned clergy: they are buying largely the most valuable divinity. Their exertions are beyond praise, and far, very far beyond their strength. Every year sends several zealous laborers, worn down almost to the grave, to Europe, to seek for a little rest, and a little change, that they may return to their work with more power and energy. How many admirable men have we already thus seen; how truly valuable and delightful have their visits been; and how precious will be these remembrances, when we shall, but too probably, "see their face no more."

British Magazine.

PROTESTANT JESUITISM.

This work is likely to produce an extended discussion, and from the indications thus far, much of warmth, not to say anger, and clamor, and harsh speaking, may be apprehended. If the book is so worthless and mischievous as some represent it, why should it awaken so much severity and ill temper? It has always been considered a bad symptom when bitter remarks, severe judgments, and unkind epithets are allowed to take the place of candid argument and manly refutation. Watchman, what of the times? "They are full of agitation, new theories and new measures multiply; panaceas are compounded with wonderful celerity, and the assurance is proclaimed that they will soon cure all the ills in the moral and religious world." We are skeptical on this subject; we do not believe that all our new plans are advancing the cause of righteousness as fast as many have supposed; and, therefore, when such a pen as that which produced Protestant Jesuitism is put forth, no wonder is raised that the inventors of new drugs and the artificers of novel machineries should be alarmed; but we regret to see men so losing sight of that charity which "hopeth all things," as to forget, that men holding different views from theirs may be equally as honest in their convictions and pure in their desires.

Since writing what precedes in this article, we have looked into some of our exchange papers, and we cannot avoid the expression of some alarm at the manifest exhibition of a spirit tending to an inquisitorial violence better suited to other days of Jesuitism than to these in which it has been believed that Protestant Christians were provoking one another to love and to good works. Soon must our "good works be evil spoken of," and our love not only "wax cold," but change to hate, if the language now common in our religious journals is to be long indulged.

(Utica) Gospel Messenger.

STEEL PENS.

A large and splendid assortment of steel pens just opened and for sale by the Episcopal Sunday School Union, 28 Ann street.

CHRISTMAS PRESENTS.

The Christian Keepsake, Biblical Annual, by the Rev. Thomas H. Horne, D.D., just received from London; and also a quantity of Religious Souvenirs for 1837, for sale at the Depository of the Episcopal Sunday School Union, 28 Ann street

SCHOOL.

The Rev. W. F. Walker having removed to Troy, opened his school for boys on the 28th instant. The school is conducted in strict subservience to the principles and interests of the Protestant Episcopal Church. *Terms*, for boarders, and every thing found them, $200 per year; for day scholars, and books and stationary found them, $12 per quarter.

Troy, Nov. 29, 1836. W. F. Walker.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL PRESS, PRINT.